

City Council Work Session Transcript – 02/07/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 2/7/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 2/7/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:06:41 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: So it looks like we have a quorum so I'm going to go ahead and convene us on this work session. It's February 7th, 2017. It is 9:05. We're in the boards and commissions room here at 301 west second street, city hall. Council the pieces that we have for today's meeting is we have two briefings, including one with some consultants that are in from DC. We also have items that have been pulled, and we have executive session. And then we have our city employees, we're having the African-American history luncheon at the palmer events center at 3:30, and I know there were a lot of councilmembers that wanted to go over and attend that. So what I would propose is that we begin with the update on the federal legislative agenda so that the folks from D.C. Can speak for us and then go about their way. Then at that point then we go to some of the pulled items so that staff with handle that and be gone. That we break at 11:30 for the event at Parmer where we're not going to be eating lunch, we're just going on in and say hello. We'll come back then for lunch and for the executive session. And then if we need to then back out on the dais to finish work. If that's okay then we'll proceed that way. Let's begin then with the presentation from the federal agenda. >> Tovo: Mayor, I apologize if I missed, what time are we breaking for the

[9:08:42 AM]

palmer for those of us who want to attend? >> Mayor Adler: 11:30. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Good morning, mayor and council. Bree bronco from the intergovernmental relations office. We will give you an update on the federal agenda. What this update will provide to you all is an update on what's happening in our new administration with the new congress and what issues we see on the horizon for the city as it relates to your federal agenda. After this update we will complete my -- my office will complete the draft of the federal agenda that we've been working on with the departments and then we will present that to you for adoption of the February 16th council meeting. Real quickly, I have with me today members of our federal lobby team, capital edge, who you also know as Ralph and joy, who have been with the city for almost 20 years and focus on representing municipalities at the federal level. Also we have Jeff booth with booth transit consulting. He has been with the city for about seven years. Previously with Holland and knight and now with his own consulting operation that focuses on transportation issues. And I know that's something that is very important to all of you. Real quickly, to give you some background on how we've been developing this, we did hold a series of work session briefings with all the departments yesterday regarding the federal agenda and some of the issues they have. Today we're here as you can see that went nonstop from 9:00 to 5:00 to meet with every

department and then today we're here to provide the briefing to you. As this team gives you the presentation today I'd like you to pay attention to certain issues that we see

[9:10:43 AM]

on the horizon and they'll go into more depth on this, but particularly as it relates to municipal bonds. We know that the administration is proposing a tax cut proposal. In order to do that they're saying to do the tax cut it will be done by possibly removing exemptions. A large exemption would be the exemption on municipal bonds. We've run some numbers is just to put on your radar with the bonds the city has outstanding right now if that exemption is removed the additional cost could be approximately 1.3 billion to the city. That doesn't include the 720 million bonds that were authorized by the voters for transportation in November. And these bonds relate to a lot of utility items so Austin energy, Austin water, there's airport in there, convention center. Also we have a lot of public safety issues, many you're familiar with. Some relate to grant issues. I know gun control something talked about a lot. And of course at the federal level we will also have probably sanctuary city legislation just like we're seeing at the state. Also we'll have to monitor what happens with the funding for cdbg and the low income tax credits. That's non-discretionary spending that also will be on the table as this congress begins its budget and looks forward. And there are other issues related to transportation, Jeff Goth will into into more specifications on that. Legal telecommunications and the right-of-way regarding the use of that city land, sorry, and public health issues. I'm now going to turn it over to Ralph who will lead us through the rest of the presentation. >> Thank you. It's good to be in Austin. I wanted to start off before I get to that to did do a quick overview of the past

[9:12:44 AM]

year, starting with some of the successes you the city had. The delegation was able to secure funding for onion creek. We received another \$10 million for onion creek, bringing that to about \$42 million in federal funding and looking to close out the federal funding of that project, 2017. On the transportation bill, and Jeff will talk more about transportation, but was-- we were able to obtain a greater allocation of highway funds to the Austin area and preserve some important programs to the city. The transportation alternatives program. And the federal transit program, both of which at the outset were under threat. We were able to fight back some efforts to preempt local authority as it relates to zoning for cell phone towers and also local regulation of drones. In the year ahead I think we'll see continued efforts in both of those areas. In the face of what -- since 2017 has been awe stairty, we've been in the sequester since 2011 and we're able to not prevent, but limit cuts to the grant programs such as cdbg, home and local law enforcement grants. >> Mayor Adler: Cdbg? >> The block grants. >> And home is the federal program that provides funds to the city for the preservation and expansion of affordable housing. One set back, but also a nice win was congress passed the permanent internet tax freedom act, which does constrain the city's ability to tax telecommunications, but that bill does preserve language that dates back to the original bill that allows the city to collect compensation for the use and emergency. Of its public rights of way. So that was a win within a loss. So looking ahead, we have the senate here and I think you all know going into the election the expectation was

[9:14:44 AM]

that the Democrats would win a small majority in the senate. That didn't happen. They gained two seats and it's now 52 Republicans to 48 Democrats. And the 48 Democrats include the two independents who caucused with the Democrats. And this is important in that that is going to impact a lot of the debate,

deliberation and final decisions that come out of the senate certainly. In the house, the Democrats gained six seats, but the Republicans maintain -- Republicans maintained an historically large majority in the house. And it's interesting. We're only one month into the new congress and the pattern of the house passing a lot of bills -- the house has been very active and has already passed many bills. I would say in the dozens. And the senate is just not going to be as fast to act. And a lot of those it bills are just going to go to the senate waiting room and wait for a very long time. That's going to be true throughout the congress, but certainly in the beginning when the senate is consumed with confirmation hearings. Pretty much through the spring, I think. So looking ahead to -- >> That's some photographs of the city's delegation. Looking ahead to 2018, and this gets back to the senate, like every two years the senate is up for reelection, so 30 senate seats will be elected. Eight are held by Republicans, 25 by Democrats. And of the 25 Democrats, 10 will be running in states that president trump won. Only one Republican from Nevada will be running for reelection in a state that Hillary Clinton won. And it's interesting when I first made the slide, kind of the conventional wisdom was going into 2018, the the

[9:16:47 AM]

Democrats are facing an uphill battle. I think what's happened over the last two weeks might change that dynamic a little bit. But nevertheless, the numbers, just the sheer numbers, certainly create a challenge for the Democrats. And that's important because if you look at that it will influence a lot of how the 10 democratic senators vote to varying degrees certainly. So looking head in the coming year, these are some of the key issues that have been identified. Bee talked a little bit about them. But certainly on the budget we're still in the era of sequestration. It goes on for another few fiscal years and I think the pressure on non-defense discretionary spending, which is the category of federal spending that impacts most programs of interest to the city, is going to face even more pressure in the coming years. So comprehensive tax reform, the president has proposed comprehensive tax reform. Comprehensive tax reform was a major part of the blueprint on which house Republicans ran for reelection. There's a lot of disagreements between house Republicans and senate Republicans, even the administration, but tax reform is an area where they have more agreements than disagreements. And I think there's a good chance that tax reform could move forward. And that really puts the tax exemption municipal bonds in the cross hair. Also the low income housing tax credit, new markets tax credits, the deduction devastate and local property taxes, I think those are on the table certainly. Infrastructure, Jeff will talk a lot more about infrastructure later, but we have in there with a question mark major infrastructure package, a question mark for a reason, I think. It's pretty far down on the list of priorities for the

[9:18:55 AM]

congressional leadership. In reauthorizing that program, which is \$40 billion in debt, is going to be a major challenge for congress, how to keep that program going forward and solvent. Local control, I mentioned we faced efforts to preempt local regulation of drones. As congress works out the F.A.A. Authorization we'll see similar efforts in that area. And then in the area of telecommunications, I think that they will be challenged to local control certainly at the state level and in congress, but really our biggest challenge will be at the FCC. There's a new chairman at the FCC and he's served as commissioner for the past few years and he holds preemption of local governments as top his priorities as local chairman. I think we will see some serious threat from the ACC to local authority. >> Mayor Adler: Hold on one second. Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I missed what you said about drones. >> I'm sorry. >> Tovo: No, it was my fault. I missed one word, but it was a critical one. >> In the last congress there was last in the F.A.A. Reauthorization bill that would have preempted all local government regulation of drones. >>

Tovo: Thank you. And you were able to push that back. >> We were. And in working with senator Cornyn in particular and I think he understood our concerns, but I think those efforts will come back certainly as they work out on the authorization. >> Tovo: Thank you very much. >> Sure. Certainly immigration is already at the forefront at the federal level, and we've seen the executive order, which is now working its way through the courts. That's been challenged by some cities, but I think we'll see sanctuary city standalone bills and also

[9:20:56 AM]

sanctuary city language, riders on appropriation bills, and that's going to be a challenge. In the area of public safety beyond grant funding I think there's still some Mohammed item for criminal -- momentum for criminal justice reform and there are senators from both parties who will continue to work on criminal justice reform. And the Obama administration I think it's safe to say had an ambitious regulatory agenda and I think that the current administration and the congressional leadership has an equally ambitious if not more ambitious deregulatory agenda. So that's certainly something that will impact the city in the year ahead. So the agenda for the first 100 days, and I tried to do this in descending order of agreement between the congressional leadership and the administration. Repeal, replace, repair the affordable care act. That's something that has started to move its way through congress already, although it's run into some pretty serious obstacles right off the bat. I think tax reform is next on the agenda and I think staff particularly on the house side is already working on writing that bill. Immigration, it is -- maybe should be a bullet up because the administration has already put out several executive orders on immigration, but I'm not sure that congress will be as quick to act on those issues. Then discretionary spending, there's pretty broad agreement between the administration and the federal leadership to increase defense spending, to increase domestic security spending as it relates to border security, which is going to put, as I said, a lot of pressure on non-defense discretionary spending. There are reports that when the administration proposes a budget it's going to be based on the heritage foundation, Republican study committee budgets. If you look at the budgets they call for major cuts to

[9:22:59 AM]

non-defense discretionary spending, including eliminating entire programs. Like the economic development administration at the department of congress, eliminating the federal transit program, so on. So that is going to set the stage. And again it goes back to that slide with the senate that's divided 52-48. I think any such proposals will run into serious opposition in the senate. So we're setting ourselves up for a scenario where passing appropriations bills will be difficult, and I see two points. We're foremonths into fy2017 and most of the federal government is running on the continuing resolution that extends last year's funding. That continuing resolution ends on April 28th so congress between now and April 28th has to decide on a final spending bill for fiscal year 2017. That's going to coincide with the federal government reaching its debt limit, so I think we're setting up a scenario in April where the administration and senate Democrats will be at loggerheads and we could be headed for a government shut down. After they resolve fy2017 they'll be in the thick of working on fy2018. Fy2017 ends in September. And again, there's such distance between the parties on discretionary spending that come September I think that they could be at loggerheads again, also headed towards another government shut down at the end of the fiscal year. So the bottom line, trying to narrow this down to what does this mean for the city, I think preserving the tax exemption for municipal bonds will be a priority challenge for local governments, along with the other tax provisions I mentioned. Preserving

funding for co-local government programs will be the second biggest challenge. And then the repeal of the

[9:24:59 AM]

affordable care act, the house Republicans in particular are eager to perform, to attack entitlement reform and cuts to other social service programs could create challenges for the city's budget. We'll have to keep a close eye on regulatory reform and keep a particularly close eye on the FCC. >> And not that I come with any better news on the transportation front. As Ralph said, we're under fy16 funding right now. As he said, the fy18 will be a challenge given some of the budget reductions that the president has proposed. A strong and persistent rumor is that the administration proposes in the budget that they will be introducing in a sort of skinny form as they refer to it on February 28th and then a full budget sometime in mid April or early may would be that they would phase out federal transportation -- federal transit funding over a four or five-year period and eliminate the capital investment grants program by maybe starting with those projects that have existing grant agreements, but not awarding any new projects in effort to kill off the program. That's a strong and persistent rumor that we're hearing as well as with respect to the budget. What I'm bringing to you now is what was presented by [indiscernible] In her testimony, but it gives some indication of where D.O.T. is going under her term as secretary of transportation. She mentioned about favoring outcome based rule making. I think if your city and metro areas there is some opportunity there. Because as we move in the change to the metro planning rule, the change moving away from level of service for automobiles that focus on moving people and moving people in corridors we now have the opportunity with data too certainly tell a different story about how you want your freeways and roads to function, focusing on the movement of the people rather than simply reaching a level of service for automobiles. So it represents an opportunity with the data to

[9:26:59 AM]

really tell that story and make databases decisions so that it could be a positive thing with that data in hand. She indicated while the program is very popular on capitol hill, she recognized that maybe she didn't embrace it, but she recognized that given the homework appropriations committee support that she could continue to support it, but as we'll talk in a minute, to me if we're looking at overall domestic spending cuts that are fairly is substantial and you're looking at the relative priority of tiger versus some of the other programs, it's hard for me to see how tiger survives in that environment where there's so many other pressures on domestic spending that maybe reduce the priority of tiger. She also talked about autonomous vehicles and drones and she sees them as being a catalyst for implementation and she wants to work with the public and private sector and really deferred on how she would respond to the rule making that was issued by the national highway traffic safety administration to begin to focus on vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to infrastructure communications, which are critical to the implementation of autonomous vehicles. But I would say one thing to be paying attention to as the city is the one thing you heard a lot from the auto manufacturers is they want a uniform set of state laws across all 50 states with respect to regulating the vehicle and the drivers and whether in fact there is a driver and whether that vehicle must have a steering wheel or not. So that being the case, there could be considerable pressure for preemption of state laws as it relates to autonomous vehicles to be able to allow the manufacturers to sell their vehicle in any state because you may recall with respect to pollution control equipment, California has a different pollution standards than most other states so the manufacturers have to produce a car solely for the state of California to meet the California rules. And

they don't particularly much care for it. And given sort of the desire to implement@, there may be some effort to preempt the state law on any jurisdiction and not develop

[9:28:59 AM]

a car specific to that state. So that will be something to pay attention to. In terms of the infrastructure plan, I think we need to put the plan in context because as you've heard from Ralph, so first -- first budget reconciliation bill deals with the affordable care act. As you've heard from Ralph we're struggling to define whether we repeal it or repair on given what we do with it and the costs in doing that. The second budget reconciliation bill has to do with tax reform and they're having a big fight within the Republican party over whether this is a bill that must be deficit neutral, meaning we need to eliminate budget, tax cuts or provide tax cuts, but eliminate exemptions to pay for the tax cuts or adjust the levels to be sure that it's deficit neutral whether we can go into debt to engage in dike storing to provide the funding under the bill. So that's important because basically the infrastructure sits behind both of those bills. To the extent that those bills take time and to the extent that the tax bill doesn't happen, the question is where do we find the resources to do an infrastructure bill given the fact that there aren't resources made available for the tax cut bill. So that's why I think it's not going to happen until early spring or late spring at the earliest. And probably not until summer. And as we'll talk in a minute, it's not, shall we say, being embraced by the house Republicans, as speaker Ryan has talked about the fact for every dollar in the infrastructure bill it must be offset by private dollars of private sector financing, which as they heard in testimony last week before the house transportation infrastructure committee, even the business community is skeptical about both how much private money is out there in the marketplace and how many projects would actually work for a public-private pip. But that's sort of been an article of faith on the part of the Republicans to move in that direction, so they are very focused on that as sort of trying to really drive this private sector

[9:31:00 AM]

financing piece as part of the bill. So I think that's going to be important. And the other element I would say to the bill, one of the ways they may be using to pay for it is repatriate assets, encourage people to bring them in and dedicate the revenues to the trust funds as a way to pay for it. Other issues that we talked about that will be important for you I think is smart cities. The question I doubt will survive is in the form introduced by the Obama administration, but there are elements that will survive and the question is how to incent the private sector on smart cities, the infrastructure around smart cities. And there's certainly support for automated vehicles and the question for the cities is how does it impact land development going forward as we begin to plan for the vehicles becoming a more pervasive part of the marketplace. >> Councilmembers, do you have any questions on what has been presented to you? >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: First of all, thanks for bringing us such terrific news. [Laughter]. I can't read the page number -- it's 13. The piece on cars having the preemption at the federal level for vehicles. Does that mean that Tesla, for example, would have an open door to come and sell their vehicles in Texas? >> [Inaudible - no mic]. It goes down to the conditions of the sale of the car versus the car itself. Historically the feds have regulated the safety of vehicles. That's been the focus of ensuring the safety of the vehicles as opposed to preempting state laws as relates to who can sell the vehicles. >> Pool: So I guess I'm asking how broad is the

[9:33:01 AM]

federal preemption. >> Midpiece is it relates more to the safety of the vehicle and looking at what constitutes a safe vehicle and being able to set standards for what's considered a safe vehicle as well as what's the pathway to introduction of going to level 5, which is a completely autonomous car. And so where the states can regulate because states vary all over the map in terms of whether there must be a driver, whether or not there must be a steering wheel, how much override can the driver have on the vehicle. And we have quite a variance among state laws in terms of what level of override can occur and even things like whether there needs to be a steering wheel. So the manufacturers are a little bit frustrated on how do we introduce our technology when we have potentially 50 different state laws that regulate what should be some the vehicle and what safety standards apply to the vehicle. So I'd say the override would be mostly on the safety side and trying to create a single standard as they attempted to do in the guidance they issued was to try to encourage suggested state laws that would regulate the vehicle that might become more mandatory as opposed to suggestions: I think it will go so far as to sale. >> Pool: Did you have anything on that, Ralph? And then I was curious, the repatriation of foreign tax rates. I was wondering how long it would take to prepay trait those dollars and when they would be effective and what would be the plan in the interim as far as funding? >> Most think that it is about a three year window. >> >> Pool: And that's if nothing is opposing it, right? >> The assumption is everyone will want to bring their assets into the united States because they now have a lower tax rate, so the assumption is that people do it right away as opposed to waiting five, six years. It's one of these provisions that will provide an immediate infusion of money, but it's not sustainable as

[9:35:01 AM]

a long-term funding source. >> Pool: Sure, because it's repatriated and then it's done. >> And then there's question of how much it will really generate in terms of how many companies will take advantage of it because at the end of the day it is about the tax rate both coming into the U.S. And obviously what the corporate tax rate will be once they're here. >> Pool: And offset by all of the foreign assets deciding to remove their companies from here and repay traiting their own. >> I don't think congress has considered that as a possibility, let's put it that way. >> Pool: Of course not. But what's the plan in the interim? >> I don't know that there is an interim plan. I think the the tax bill -- Mitch Mcconnell has said that he wanted to wait until 2017 to do a tax bill. And all the discussion around surface transportation was that would be the opportunity to begin to look stay sustainable funding source for surface transportation. Defining what that sustainable funding source, whether it's the gas tax, the BMT vehicles, vehicle miles traveled tax, has to be determined, but that was the one opportunity because it could be part of a broader tax bill where it would not stand out on its own. But we've still got to get consensus around a tax bill in terms of what's in there and what's not in there. And I think that will prove to be challenging. >> Pool: So your best guess on a time frame for this rolling out? Would it be five years from now? >> The trump infrastructure bill or the finance? >> Pool: Kind of a settling down of all the elements that are in competition and in conflict with the repatriation of other than assets, if that were -- of foreign assets, if that were to happen. >> I think it would be three to four years and they would make those assumptions -- okay. This is only in congress can we deem that those revenues will arrive in the united States as opposed to actually having it happen. So they will deem a certain response by the private sector and they will therefore identify a number and incorporate that in the tax code as an assumption

[9:37:02 AM]

around the numbers and they will work with that as the operating assumption and never -- maybe five years from now they'll actually see whether that materialized, but the assumptions that will be the

operating assumption that will be the basis for setting policy based on that number going forward. >> Pool: Okay, thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar? >> Casar: Thank y'all for coming. I'm pretty clear about what the legislative agenda is and what we push on on things like municipal bonds or I am abrasion issues, but on the -- on immigration issues, but I understand that there's not tons of clarity yet about exactly what it will be except it will be fantastic on all levels. But besides that are there -- are there particularly areas where we have maybe -- maybe she's the best person to answer this. Generally what our influences and ideals are on it, especially when it comes to privatization of infrastructure, being able to set our own public works standards through contracting as we do being able to have influence over which projects are selected and how those roll out. Are there particular places where we already have a stance and are pushing, or are we sort of waiting to see more details of what's getting proposed? >> Well, Jeff can speak even more to this, but one of the things that we need to start doing is identifying what we consider to be shovel ready projects to the extent that they are shovel ready. But also -- and these are the discussions we have with departments yesterday. And clearly in terms of infrastructure and looking at what that would mean, looking at something that we develop a broader consensus around would be another recommendation from this team. So I-35. I-35, for instance. In terms of an infrastructure work, in terms of being as close as we get to shovel ready and also would include a broader impact on Austin. So when you look at our delegation, it represents areas outside of Austin as well and how that kind of work could bring them to the table.

[9:39:03 AM]

Something like that was one of the top things that were talked about. >> The only other thing I would talk about is when he discusses infrastructure it's well beyond highways and transit. It's schools, it's the power grid. It's a broad range of investments that he has defined as infrastructure. And I have to keep pointing out that the one thing that consistently is omitted in the description of the infrastructure plan is anything with respect to transit. But he defines it very broadly. So I think there's sort of everything in the kitchen sink approach. And other than that there are very few details about this infrastructure plan. >> Casar: That is helpful in figuring out how we direct which projects, but I guess part of my project is how we do it because my sense is there's a possibility that how these things are funded and what's tied to how you do it may be different given the sort of dedication to private investment and to so-called cutting of -- the potentially lowering of standards. Has there been much talk of that? >> He's already issued an executive order to try to streamline project development. So that's already been issued, although it frankly doesn't look a whole lot different than all the other executive orders issued by president Obama that set out to do the same thing. I think the one thing that is very true with president trump is he wants to build America by America. So basically he is very focused on bringing those jobs to the United States. One can expect an even greater emphasis on buy America and raising the expectations of sort of U.S. Products and U.S. Laborers working on projects. So I think that's a big feature of what he's proposing. And lastly on the public-private partnerships, at this point all they're doing it trying to create incentives, tax cuts, leveraging existing federal programs, the idea of a federal infrastructure bank is to fund big projects so I-35 could be a potential

[9:41:03 AM]

candidate. The state infrastructure bank that has the wherewithal to be able to develop a project like that. So those are all -- even national infrastructure bank could select those projects as priority projects and so we would want to be ready if in fact something like that got stood up to be able to advance I-35 because then it would qualify as one of those projects. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: I have a question related to the affordable care act. There's a lot of questions out there about

the things that will happen and starting to happen. I would be interested in hearing from you to the degree that you want to speculate about where you think we'll end up or what direction you think we're going on that. And with whatever level of detail that you feel is appropriate to say, you know, because there's a lot of discussion about how it's being talked about and how -- what really might happen in terms of the specifics. So I'm specifically concerned about the subsidies and the increase in the medicaid expansion. Of course that doesn't help us in Texas, but I am interested in what's going to happen with the subsidies, the medicaid expansion in particular. >> And it is difficult to speculate because the politics right now. For the past six years the Republican leadership in congress has been saying they want to repeal the affordable care act. And now they are in charge of both the house and senate and the presidency. And they've Teed that up as their top priority. They've passed a budget resolution that sets up reconciliation to repeal the affordable care act. And in the house you have a pretty strong segment of rank and file Republicans for whom nothing short of repeal, effective immediately, will -- anything short of that will not sit well with them.

[9:43:04 AM]

And they're pretty adamant that's what we're going to do. Whereas in the senate, which is very closely divided, you have some Republican senators who are raising some concerns about what is this going to mean to the health care marketplace? What is this going to mean to my state. And so that's a dynamic that hasn't worked itself out yet, I don't think. And I mention reconciliation because that's important. I'll try not to get too much into Washington budget gobbledegook, but the important thing about doing it under reconciliation is that they can't repeal the entire affordable care act under reconciliation. They're doing it under reconciliation because that can't be filibustered in the senate, it only needs 51 votes in the senate. But under a obligation bill you can only address tax issues. So the bill they're looking to pass right now is a bill that would repeal the individual mandate because that's in the form of a tax. It would repeal the other taxes that pay for the subsidies. And it would repeal medicaid expansion, but it would not repeal the requirement that preexisting conditions be covered. It would not repeal the requirement that a set menu of conditions be covered. And so those things don't work absent the mandate in the subsidies. So they -- and that's where the concern on the -- from some senate Republicans comes from is they're setting up an unworkable situation. And I don't know if they've identified -- they've identified replacements, but not any that would cover the same number of people at the same level of care.

[9:45:05 AM]

So that's -- they've kind of boxed themselves in I think it's fair to say. >> Kitchen: Okay. And then of course the reconciliation would be a route to taking away the supplements that some people are eligible for. >> Yes. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> And beyond medicaid expansion, I mentioned entitlement reform earlier, and I think particularly for the house Republicans or speaker Ryan, entitlement reform might be his top priority. That is -- I think that is a career long goal of his. The president ran on the platform that he wouldn't touch medicare and social security. He never said anything about medicaid, the children's health insurance program, nutrition assistance programs. So you start to see where can they tackle some entitlement reform and it really goes towards the medicaid, chip, nutrition assistance side of things. >> Kitchen: Do you think that -- what is your thinking currently to the extent that, you know, we know, about block grants? Do you think that's really where they're headed? >> Based on -- you know, the president ran on an ambitious agenda, but not a very detailed one. The house Republicans ran on an ambitious and very detailed agenda. And beyond that you have previous budget resolutions that have passed the house. And essentially what they call for is a block granting of medicaid, capping the funds for medicaid and essentially turning the program over to the states to administer as they see fit. And

under that program there would be less funding for medicaid, especially as we go. Because what the budget resolution in previous congresses did was cap medicaid and kind of keep it capped. So that would get more onerous in the out years for states to provide the same level of service.

[9:47:06 AM]

>> Kitchen: And of course the danger in there too or the risk for people is the -- when you take away the entitlements that the group of people who may be eligible is no longer protected. >> Right. >> Kitchen: In terms of their eligibility. The other thing that's not protected is the services they can receive. >> Exactly. That's how it's set up. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else? What about the -- talk for a second about the tax exempt bonding issue. What do you think the prognosis of that is? >> I think that's one of those issues that, you know, sometimes when you talk to individual members or their staff they say that's not going to happen. We're not going to do that. But the reality is the tax reform they want to do is a pretty serious cut in rates, and they're going to be looking for offsets. When they say -- when they say, a, everything is on the table. And B, we want to cut rates and broaden the base, and that means that I think you have to take the threat to the tax exempt bonds seriously. The estimate is removing that exemption would bring in \$30 million a year in revenue. So if you're staff on one of the tax rating committees, that becomes an awfully tempting place to get some revenue to offset the lower tax rates. So I think the threat is serious. I think I would add that I -- I'd rather be wrong at the end of the day. Maybe it's not a serious threat. That's fine, but I think as long as they're doing tax reform we have to take that threat very seriously. It's almost an existential issue for cities. You take that away and you take away the main -- Jeff talked a lot about infrastructure, and you have the president who has proposed this big tax credit plan where we would provide tax credits for private sector investments and restructure. You have proposals for a national infrastructure bank.

[9:49:06 AM]

You have proposals for tax credit loans. And the interesting thing about all that is that local government, the same local government don't lack financing for projects. We have plenty of financing. We issue general obligation bonds, you can issue general revenue bonds. Funding is the missing piece, not financing. So in a lot of ways these proposals are a solution in search of a problem. And the tax free community bonds has worked well for over 100 years. The federal government supports state and federal infrastructure with a minimum of bureaucracy and interference and it really maximizing local decision making. It's important to remember 75% of all infrastructure investments in this country are made by state and local governments. >> Could you also talk to the trade-off between infrastructure plan and the bonds at the end of the day exemption? >> Right. At the end of the day, particularly I mean in infrastructure plan that comes out as we've seen them outlined is kind of a one-time deal of the tax exempt community bonds is there. Is there permanently. So I think that -- but I do think the threat is serious to answer your question and I think we have to take it seriously. >> Mayor Adler: So when the mayor land cleave ove and Benjamin met with him, apparently he said that he wouldn't do that and there was a press conference afterwards with the attendees at the meeting. Has he ever confirmed that coming out of the meeting? >> I have not confirmed that since then, but I think that was -- and the mayor's referring on the leadership of the U.S. Conference of mayors met with the president in December and the point of the meetings they brought up was a tax exemption community bonds and at a time the president-elect said of course we're not going to do that. That's not something I would support. I support maintaining the tax exemption. And the three mayors very wisely got off the elevators

[9:51:07 AM]

in the lobby of trump tower and told the assembled press what the president had just said, and they followed up that with a letter to the congressional leadership outlining what the president had just said about tax exempt muny bonds. >> Mayor Adler: But no confirmation from him publicly? >> Not that I've seen or heard, no. No tweets. [Laughter] Not yet. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Troxclair? >> Troxclair: You said at the beginning of your presentation that you secured an additional \$10 million for onion creek buyouts for a total of I think you said 42 million. >> I prefer to say your delegation secured that. >> Troxclair: Sure. Mayor pro tem tovo, correct me if I heard this wrong in our audit and finance committee yesterday, but when I asked that question to our staff, they basically said that Austin had made a decision to invest -- to go ahead and invest in the buyouts rather than waiting for federal assistance. And when I asked how long it would have taken or how much we would have gotten from the federal government if we had chosen to wait, they said it was around \$750,000. So basically the -- it wasn't worth -- the amount of money wasn't worth the wait. But this is -- I don't know if this is from a different flood or how the \$42 million corresponds with the city's buyout program and the money that we've spent. >> Sure. In every corps of engineers project is different, but generally the division is 65/35 for a corps of engineers flood damage reduction project. Where the corps puts in 65% of the project cost and the local project sponsor is 35%. It's been awhile since I've looked at the detailed outline of onion creek, but I think the city's share was in the 20 million, 20

[9:53:07 AM]

something-million-dollar range on that project? >> Troxclair: So are we talking about the same project? >> Oh. >> There was a core area and that was where the federal money went and the city did a 25 year floodplain and then 100 year and those were outside the core area. So that was city funding of what was not in the core area. >> Right. The core -- thank you. I understand, yes, the core project area was smaller than the overall project area. >> Troxclair: Okay. >> That's -- for various reasons of laws and corps of engineers regulations. >> Troxclair: And I guess do you agree with that assessment that had we waited for federal funding -- because it was an audit and we were comparing the city's flood buyout program to those of other municipalities that it had major flood events. And some of the other municipalities have waited for the federal assistance. Was there more -- if the city had waited, do you feel like there would be more money? >> Possibly. It's always hard to say. And it's one of the more frustrating and difficult things with these projects is, you know, the corps of engineers and the federal government have made the commitment that they're going to do 65% of the project, but that's always subject to congressional appropriations. And the ordinance of engineers' budget is in-- the corps of engineers' budget is incredibly over subscribed. On there's approximately -- I'm pulling this off the top of my head -- \$45 million a year for the corps of engineers for construction. And that sounds like a lot, but that's for the whole country and it doesn't come close to meeting the need in any given year. So even a project like onion creek, which is a relatively small project, has been funded 10 million one year, five million the next year.

[9:55:07 AM]

And it's frustrating because in the meantime the homeowners are waiting to be bought out and are still in danger of being flooded. So it's always -- every buyout project there's always that, well, the federal government has committed to 65%. Do we wait for appropriations to cover that 65%, or do we go ahead and buy out homeowners and wait for reimbursement. >> Troxclair: Thanks for that. I just have one more clarification. If the city had chosen to wait, which again we didn't, but just for future reference, if

the city had chosen to wait for the 25-year floodplain and the 100-year floodplain, would there have been an assumption or a hope that we would have gotten 65% of funding? Because I understood from our staff yesterday that the amount of money that we were talking about from the federal government was negligible. They said less than a million dollars. So the \$42 million was a much larger number. I understand that they were different projects, but how do we get -- what is the difference between the project that could have been funded 65% and -- >> Sure. The difference is working your way through the corps of engineers process, the corps of engineers bureaucracy. And for such a small amount of money, it's probably easier to go ahead and just do it on your own as the city. I -- my -- I have to say this carefully because I'm in public. My advice to clients before they embark on a corps of engineers project is think long and hard about whether or not you may be able to do it yourselves. And a certain monetary level of course it makes a lot of sense to have the federal government pay 65%, but it does slow down the project. >> Troxclair: Okay. Thanks for that input. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza? >> Garza: Can clarification, the 25 and 100 was a city policy decision. I don't think they could have gotten federal money

[9:57:07 AM]

for those. That was a city policy. I think they could have maybe gotten more money for the core area, but the other areas was purely city money and the council decided to do that on their own. >> Troxclair: Again, from the presentation yesterday, our city staff did say -- our real estate said that the city made the decision to do city money instead of waiting for federal money. So -- anyway, it doesn't -- >> Garza: But they're talking about for the core area. >> Troxclair: No, we weren't. We were talking about the city programs. >> Garza: It should have been just the core area. That's the only area they were waiting for federal money for. They weren't -- you were on the council then when they -- >> Tovo: Yeah. I don't want to speak to the details because I won't get them right, but I thought yesterday when we were talking -- when we were looking at the audit in terms of the city programs, I think the analysis that the audit was doing was looking at compliance with what were policy decisions, so we've compared them to the federal guidelines and say the decisions we made diverged from some of the monies that would have been available through the federal program. >> Garza: I'll send you a copy of the audit so you can see that note. >> >> Renteria: I know you mentioned something about affordable housing, homes and cdbg grant money that we get 'and my understanding it from the bush administration they cut it every year. Did you see it being cut during this administration? >> It's hard to forecast, but possibly yes. I think that the city and local governments in general will have to work hard to protect community block grants and the home program

[9:59:07 AM]

in the coming years. It's a combination of the administration it signals it wants to pursue pretty considerable cuts to non-discretionary spending and then beyond that just the general overall budget pressure on defense discretionary spending. So we'll have to work hard to protect those >> Mayor Adler: Anything else? Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: This is more of a question for us, I think. At some point we were going to have some conversation about the -- how we might be impacted from a financial stand point. And so I'm just curious about when that conversation might happen or how it might happen. I know the staff has been looking into the potential impact on us. Was that something that we were going to do in executive session? I'm just trying to understand what the follow-up is on that. >> Mayor Adler: Of the -- >> Kitchen: For us to understand both from a -- from a federal and state impact, what are the potential reductions in funding. >> Mayor Adler: From the sanctuary city issue. >> Kitchen: It may go beyond that, with some of the other -- my thinking was it might be helpful for us as a group to just have an

understanding of what -- of what the impact might be to us financially across a range of programs. I know that we received a memo related to that. >> Mayor Adler: We did, we are set on executive session on the 14th, next Monday. >> Kitchen: That was my question. >> Mayor Adler: Next Tuesday, sorry. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much for the presentation. Safe travel home. Councilmembers, it's 10:00. We want to try to get through the pulled items here. Get us up to the -- to the council meeting and agenda stuff last. Let's see where we are.

[10:01:10 AM]

Hdr engineering, Ms. Kitchen you pulled that? >> Houston: Excuse me, mayor. How many other briefings do we have, I see staff sitting here sometime we have one other briefing, the -- the convention center briefing. And we have staff here waiting for that. We have staff here that's waiting for the pulled items that we had. So however we do this, we're going -- >> Houston: What about the city manager? Is that something that we're going to discuss today? >> Mayor Adler: That's been pulled today. Something also for us to discuss. But there's no one here for that. Ms. Kitchen, do you want to talk about the hdr quickly? >> Kitchen: Yes, I pulled the item because I think it's very helpful for us to understand and for the public to understand the scope of the work of the consultant. I think it's great progress. I think that the backup really lays out very nicely what the scope of work of the consultant will be. I wanted to run through the scope of work, that section, confirm my understanding of when our best guess of when those things would come back to the council, which things would come back to the council for our review and approval. I also thought that I would take this opportunity, I won't speak to it unless people want to. But I did prepare, you know, we had a -- here you can pass that back. We had a mobility committee meeting last week. So we had some briefings and so in keeping with the spirit in keeping the rest of the council up to date on what we talked about, we put together a very short two pager on what was discussed at that meeting. Again, I won't go into it unless people want more review of that. One of the things that we discussed. You let us know last week what was coming, we didn't have the specific backup. We talked in general last week about what the scope was, but we have more

[10:03:11 AM]

specifics now. If you could just quickly go over -- I think five phases, if you just want to hit the deliverables from each of those five phases, then explain which ones come back to the council. My reading was the first four phases involved items that go into the construction, corridor construction program, those could come back to us, I want to confirm that, does that make sense? >> I think so. Mike Trimble, director with the corridor program implementation office. You are correct, councilmember. Really this first phase will be really getting underway with those first four phases of work that are in the scope of services. So first and foremost, we're getting the consultant to help us with the development of a prioritization criteria and analysis to develop the corridor construction program. Requested by council, directed by council in the contract with the voters in resolution. So that will be kind of one of the big tasks that the corridor consultant will be doing, but other scopes of work as well. They will also be coming a communications and engagement plan, very robust plan, that we'll be working with them on that will also be a part of that really first phase of initial services. They will also be working on developing an mbe/wbe outreach plan in conjunction with city staff and smbr. Then they will also be doing some analysis on ways to enhance capital delivery services, looking at best practices, bringing kind of some good ideas for how we can potentially accelerate delivery. Again that's in consideration of the eight year implementation time frame that's been directed by council through the resolution. So there will be a lot of several months. We anticipate that obviously in the resolution the corridor construction program will come back to

[10:05:12 AM]

council for approval. That was directed before any construction funds were authorized. We anticipate that work will probably take about nine months for the corridor consultant to do again on a very expedited schedule. Around this time next year, we communicated to the mobility community, we anticipate getting the corridor consultant on board with an executed contract in March. So working from there around this time next year we would anticipate coming back to council with a proposed corridor construction program. We would also anticipate as a leadup to that one of the interim deliverables that the consultant has is developing prioritization criteria. That goes back to the resolution in several of the outcomes that we need to look at. Looking at traffic congestion, safety considerations, coordination with imagine Austin, looking at imagine Austin as well, all of the local regional plans, there was a lot of different pieces that we need to consider as part of the prioritization for which projects to bring forward as part of the corridor construction program. That will all be part of the analysis, we will bring by the prioritization criteria to council as well so you can see how those criteria are being put together. As we're getting ready to apply those to the projects that are in the corridor program as well. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much, that's very helpful. That confirms what I was thinking. Last question, this I is all of the corridor construction door construction program and stuff like that. That last question relates to the third bucket. Three buckets of funding. I think that I understand from our conversation last week that third bucket is moving forward and that's the bucket where we're talking about the sub-- what do we call them? The road improvements on specific roads? The safety issues. The -- the sidewalks, the bikes, the school, the school plan. That's going forward. Right?

[10:07:13 AM]

The list of those projects, that will be funded this year, is -- I thought that was coming back to us at the end of February. Did I misunderstand that or am I right about that. >> Robert goodis city manager. We're bringing to the council on February 28th a first look of the full eight year program with the first year being more in focus than year two, three, four, five. What we will be able to accomplish with city lifting from staff side to remove some of the obstacles in the way to deliver an effective program. We are still in the middle of trying to develop those processes and do things in three months rather than 12. Those are ongoing efforts. Those ideas will be no cast in concrete, but fairly what we know now, there will be a snapshot that we know now trying to estimate on what the eight year program will look like, including the whole 27 million. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Troxclair. >> Troxclair: Mayor I pulled this item as well because I wanted to talk about the difference between the top two firms, such a close comparison and such a big and important project, I just wanted to make sure that we are confident that we're hiring the right firm. I guess my original question came looking at program ... 12.83 and 67. I don't know if this was in the backup or if my staff pulled the bios of the program managers, but it seems like just from again reading over the program manager bio from hntb and then the one from the other

[10:09:14 AM]

company, the recommended company, the second place company seems to have a lot more experience with larger projects, like big budgets, multi-modal projects, a lot of moving pieces. Someone who is a lot more knowledgeable than me in this area was explaining to me the difference between project management and program management. Project being kind of one specific -- one specific and project being multiple projects at the same time. And it seemed to me on first glance that -- that the -- one from hntb had a lot more experience, but she was scored lower on criteria. So I was just hoping that you

could help me understand that. >> Good morning, [indiscernible]. Good morning, Fernandez [indiscernible] Contracting office. Let me walk you through the criteria that we have. Provided as backup with the request for council action. We look at eight individual items. In looking at the item that you are speaking of in terms of item no. 4th, we break it down into two different things that we look for, the project manager experience or in this case the program manager, also the program principle. So we break down the points that are available for this criteria, 20 points available, we break it down to 15 and 5th respectively. As you notice, there is a small difference was that .16, if I added that correctly, difference between the hdr program manager and also the hntb program manager. I don't have the specifics in terms of what we provided for -- for the details between back and forth between the levels of experience that one had or the other. I will tell you that we're pretty confident in our recommendation. [Indiscernible] In terms of the overall composite scoring that we provided as part of the evaluation

[10:11:15 AM]

process. But I don't have the specific details to look out, you know, what separated one or the other right now. This specific item but I can tell you that there was a lot of good discussion that we had, as part of the evaluation process. In fact, so much good discussion that even though there was a -- a three point spread, which is what we noted in the request for qualification that determines whether or not we have interviews, because there was a -- again, a lot of good, you know, conversation, a lot of good points that the evaluation panel provided back to us. That we made the determination to have interviews just to provide some clarification about what we read in the submittal that the firms provided. So really competitive firms. Absolutely. As you can see, in the criteria, they were pretty close and the majority of the items, I think with the exception of item no. 3 B where you saw -- excuse me, I think it was -- well, yeah, 3 B where you saw a bigger gap between number 1st hntb and the other firms, pretty close knit, again that's why we went into the interview process, asked for the questions, further details of the submittal, capacity of their experiences. Based on the interview process, you know, there was a -- a smaller spread that was developed between hdr, our recommendation and the second-ranked firm hntb. >> Troxclair: What led you to just say that you are very -- not just pretty confident, but very confident in your recommendation knowing that the scores were so close. >> Just the level of conversation that we had. We had six executive level panel members that reviewed the information. We also -- there was a lot of great dialogue back and forth between what we saw in terms of information that was provided by the firms, how it compared to the evaluation criteria. And so there was a lot of great conversation, there was a lot of back and forth perspectives, you know, there was challenges in terms of I saw this, here's what I think what's really good about this versus, you know, I think this about this. So based on that conversation, which is

[10:13:18 AM]

really dynamic conversation, went we had our number 1st ranked firm. Again additional questions that came up. There was some clarity that we wanted to seek from the top two firms, that's why we invited them to the interview process. What the interview process confirmed or affirmed for us, right, was that we were -- the number one firm based on the review of the submittals was still number one overall based on the information that they provided and that criteria that we had. So -- >> Troxclair: Did you have a lot of discussion -- I guess, again, transportation engineer who I guess was following this issue called me and wanted in he to review the backup information and again was just pointing out the difference in program experience versus project experience. So can you -- the number one firm has experience with specific projects, city of San Marcos, loop 82 overpass. City of Round Rock, cr 122

reconstruction, city of Austin, a bridge extension. But then the number 2nd -- firm has project program management consultants, ctrma, \$3.9 billion program, they were co-located with the client, the next one was \$25 billion multi-modal public/private partnership corridor and anyway goes on and on. So it does seem after learning about the difference it does seem like the second place people have clearly more experience with bigger -- with bigger projects that have a lot of moving parts, which I think that this bond will have. So it just seems like that's a really important criteria. And I want to better understand why me looking at this and reading this and having that impression wasn't the same conclusion that maybe the staff had come to. >> Councilmember, along those lines, you know, as Rolando mentioned we had a lot of discussion amongst the evaluation panel on the

[10:15:19 AM]

experience, but also it really is in the context of comparable experience. So we also had to look at, for this particular scope of work, the most comparable project experience or program experience based on those that are proposed. So the program manager and the program principal, some of the points that you brought up, absolutely, were a part of the conversation. Different folks that were proposed by different firms, they had different skills. Some of them had project or program management experience for very large programs. However, we had to come back to what is the particular scope of work. We are not hiring a program manager straight up. >> Troxclair: Right, sure. >> That's why you have a core program implementation office. We don't need to hire a person who was a program manager for a multi-million dollar program. We had a very particular scope of work to complement and supplement the work of city staff. All of that, what you brought up, what I'm bringing up right now, that was all a part of the conversation that led as a part of the evaluation process and all of that was considered. All of these things were being discussed. >> So the -- what you just said, your first sentence was the most important thing is the comparable program experience. That's why you all looked at. But if that's item 5th on the score sheet and if you look at the prime firms comparable program experience, the second place company scored higher than the first place company. >> That was definitely part of the conversation, I'm sure they scored higher because those things were factored in. >> If I may, I want to emphasize the importance of there is several different criteria items, right? You can look at the criteria that was again that was brought to you as backup, there's variances in terms of one scores higher in this area than the other one. So many things that are important, so many things that we look at and score. At the end of the day is the totality of everything that we look at, who provides the overall best team to help us deliver this project. That's what we looked at comprehensively. >> Troxclair: Okay. Ultimately both scored very highly. It's up to the council to decide which firm to award

[10:17:20 AM]

the contract to, right? >> [Indiscernible] Providing a really strong recommendation. Council at the end of the day has the authority to accept staff's recommendation or go a different route. >> Troxclair: I'll do some more research between now and Thursday. Thank you. .>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor? I appreciate the questions. I think it's PARTF the council's responsibility, you know, to review what you are bringing forward. I would say to my mind I place a great deal of importance on the overall score, I'm very familiar with consulting and working with teams. So I think that the overall scores is the highest priority for me, there is a significant difference here between the first and second. Of course the other thing that I think is very important is your assessment. Because you've been through all of this with them, you've dug into the details and you've talked to them. So I think that's really important. So I will be supporting the recommendation from the -- >> If I may add -- thank you for that. If I may add to it, it's not only the prime firm, it's the entire team and it's how they want to approach in

their proposed team structure and their approach on how they're going to do our project, so some of that is how they've done previous projects and their experience, that brings them to the table and obviously the top two, that got them in the room. Austin proposed program, what are you going to do for us to help us implement council's vision. That's -- you can't see that on paper, that's part of what the interview process is about that this team looked very closely. Just to add that to the mix as well. >> So you mentioned that you would be bringing -- after we select the consultant, you would be bringing back to council at least for a report back, I guess my question is how much influence we would have on

[10:19:20 AM]

the report back about prioritization of -- of corridor planning. Can you y'all talk us through, I'll pick something arbitrary, that would not happen, you know, if it comes back that corridors will need prioritized based on the number of spruce trees as opposed to cedar trees that line them and we want it the other way around. How do you expect that process to go? Because I know we laid out some priorities clearly in the enabling resolution for the bond. But we didn't explain how much we wanted those to be weighted against one another. So once we go through the process of selecting a consultant, can you talk us through how we would interface with that matrix? >> Speaking of that, that's a good segue so what I talked about earlier about their approach. This is going to be a lot of data, but it's going to be an art. Because if you take a moment and go back and look at the resolution where you all gave us that direction, there's three priorities, four allowances, there's 10 things to look at here. It's a -- it's a really comprehensive, broad look. So we're going to have to work really closely with the consultant to develop and they are talking about developing a good computer model to put all of these inputs into and then come out with some alternatives. Before those inputs are -- are developed or after they're developed, that's when we need council's direction on were these what you were thinking. When you had this long laundry list in your resolution, this is what we think you meant, is this -- are we on the right track. We don't want to do eight months of work and come back to you all and say that's not even close to what we were thinking about. There has to be interaction along the way. That's one of the first discussions we'll have with the consultant is how -- when they see those milestones, will we bring this back to the full body to discuss. This is what we think you meant by reduced congestion, what our metric looks like and how much that weighs in relationship to improving the level of service. So we're going to have to do

[10:21:21 AM]

that in order to end in nine months when you all say good it, build that. There are going to have to be considerations, when we don't know, we'll have to talk to the consultant about when there's the appropriate milestone to bring that back and talk to you. >> Casar: That potentially is a place where you are bringing that back, rcas and action items for us to weigh in or more an iterative dialogue. >> More of an iterative dialogue is what we envision rather than having an rca that says these are the exact -- I'm not sure that it's going to -- we don't like how much you have weighted that, we would like you to put more weight in that direction. But that will play out as we move forward through this as well. >> Casar: Okay, that's helpful, thank you. >> Kitchen: Just to clarify, at the end of the day, at the end of nine months or whenever it is, after we've built all of this up, that's the point where the council will vote to approve the construction program? >> We'll have an official corridor construction program without -- with action from council. >> Kitchen: At the end of this iterative process that you're talking about. >> That's exactly right. >> Casar: I guess part of -- one part that's not arbitrary as that might be, knowing what our prioritization may be, may influence the conditions on the ground. For example, if we wanted to prioritize areas where landowners chose to [indiscernible] Themselves in order to provide funding,

gap projects, if they knew that was part of our prioritization, that may influence ultimately what projects we recommend at the end of the process. There may be some need for there to be some of that clarity in the middle of the process for us to get the best results. But I suppose that's probably a conversation best to be had with the consultant once we choose one. I just wanted to make sure that we are not precluding that conversation by -- by kicking off this contract

[10:23:22 AM]

today. I was pretty sure that was the case, but I think it's helpful for it to be sort of on record, for everybody to be aware of that. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I would think as this develops, we could certainly give guidance in the form of -- of something more specific to you all along the way. If that makes sense from what -- if I'm understanding what you are saying, councilmember Casar, it might make sense, some ways along the way to pass the will of the council so that it will help you get clarity. If that's needed. As that comes up, we can certainly do that, I would expect. >> Ms. Pool? >> Pool: Thanks I appreciate the work that you all did in order to boil down the consultant qualifications through the evaluation. The two items that I'm looking at here -- that I'm looking at here, items 7th and 8th the team's experience with city of Austin issues and the city of Austin's experience with the prime. I think those are real important because we're going to have to have a very close relationship with the prime and the subcontractors in order to ensure that we get the work done in the relatively circumscribed amount of time. In order to make sure that we can mitigate, keep as low as possible any cost overruns. I think the high scoring in those two items speaks to that tie close into our overseeing of it and ensure that we can meet all of the goals and keep any -- goals and keep any overruns to a minimum. So I'm -- I'm the same place where councilmember kitchen is with regarding to supporting your recommendations for number one. >> Mayor Adler: Council, I pulled item 29 because I thought it was real important in case people had questions or responses looks like there were some answers

[10:25:23 AM]

to some of the questions that were handed out to us. I think there is one candidate, the combined team is here in case we had any questions for them. In case there was any discussion on that issue. While we were together as a group. If not we'll go on to the next item. Okay, next item was item 34, council committee and council meetings. >> We skipped 24. >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, 24. Sorry, go ahead. >> Mayor, I just wanted to remind you that I have a quick question for item 5th. >> Mayor Adler: We will do that next since it's something that you are doing for the record. >> Kitchen: Thank you all. I apologize, I didn't have a chance to ask this offline, this may be very quick. But I really appreciate all of the work that you all are doing on identifying properties. I think that's excellent, as we discussed. And it's -- it's very important that we talk about solutions to our -- to the fact that we're having to do so much, you know, leasing. But I had some additional questions that came up to me after we had our conversation about the A.C.C. Site. And so if -- you don't have to answer them now, but it's questions that I have about I'm very, very concerned about where we place the planning and development departments because they have such interaction with other departments. And they also have a lot of interaction with us at city hall. So I'm concerned about the -- I'm -- we had some conversation, but I remain concerned about the -- about the location. So I'm looking for some assurances that being located so far from city

[10:27:25 AM]

hall, I'm looking for two reassurances. First that we won't inadvertently end up with more of a siloed approach. In other words because this department has so much connection -- both these departments

have so much connection with transportation, with water, you know, with water, with -- with economic development, with a lot of other departments and that those -- my question is that those -- those interconnections might go beyond just one component of transportation, for example. So -- so I'm concerned of -- about -- about not inadvertently siloing and the location being too far. Concerned about that. I'm also concerned about all of the interaction with city hall and inadvertently requiring our staff to go back and forth and back and forth so much. So we have done such a great job and we've focused a lot on -- on making sure that these departments are really connected to -- to the -- you know, to the rest of our departments. And so I want to make sure that we're not inadvertently doing that. Then the second aspects of that is -- this is more of a detail, to be worked out later, that is just in terms of boards and commissions, I really think the boards and commissions need to stay here, centrally located. Because our -- our citizens come from all over the city. And so -- so I think that -- I think that moving boards and commissions meetings to A.C.C. Area, highland mall area, you all know what I'm talking about, is -- I don't think it's a good practice. So anyway so my question is first let me focus -- my first question is how is that location going to work with the necessity of coordinating with all of the other departments that we've got? Which are not going -- that are located closer to city

[10:29:27 AM]

hall? >> Greg Canale finance department. Just thank you, councilmember for those questions. We appreciate it. We know this is -- there's a lot of elements here that we've talked about and so we're happy to kind of go through them again. I'll take you back, I'll let Rodney and Greg talk about specifically operations. But in terms of an approach, when we first approached this problem, which was a problem of no space and trying to get out of very expensive lease space from both an operational perspective and a financial model, we landed on this new model that we've been talking to council about over the last 18 months. One of the ways that we got to that issue about space was we went through really for the if irs time in the city, we went through a rigorous space planning programming exercise. Where -- where not only did we look at the work and functions that -- that development services in the planning and zoning department have, but their interactions. In fact, last March we talked about the jacency. When we talked about our fee response, all of that was part of that, the responses embodied that from both an overall space perspective as well as from a perspective as -- as of the type of space it needed to be to allow for both those formal and informal interactions so that the work, the very interconnected work, that Rodney and Greg's group have can continue and not only continue but I think be enhanced with a new space that is currently for them in suboptimal spaces. >> Thank you, Greg, thank you councilmember, Rodney Gonzalez, director for development services. We do share those same concerns as well. The location was only -- it wasn't the only factor. It was one of many factors in this consideration. But currently just so that council is aware, we do share the space at one Texas center with some departments, but not all

[10:31:27 AM]

departments. When you look at all of the departments that are involved in the development process, not all of them are with us currently, we too have that situation of not having all of the departments with us. With this new space we will have ample room to actually bring more departments on board with us to co-locate with us, so that way we can have the full [indiscernible] Of all departments involved in the development process. We want to accomplish that because for the reasons that you have stated it helps us when we are processing applications to have those companion departments with us. I can tell you right now that's not the case. We do have some departments that are not with us. I believe the goal back in 2006 was to create kind of a one-stop shop model, similar to what you are talking about. We got

probably about halfway there, but we didn't finish the job. And some departments began peeling away from one Texas center, not because they weren't committed to -- to the one stop shop model, but we simply ran out of space at one Texas center. And that's the case that we have right now as council heard me talk about many times, we need additional resources within the department, staff resources. We don't have the space to add those staff resources. So we're balancing those concerns that you've shared with us, that we also have, with the concerns that -- that if we were to ask for more staff, which we need to, we don't currently have the space to do that. And in fact we are looking at moving one of our divisions within the department off-site and in order to make room for additional staff. There were things that we're going to be utilizing to balance the concerns that you had elaborated. Number one is using more technology, such as video conferencing. Adding that as a capability within the new facility, we can do more video conferencing. Currently because there are different locations of staff, there is a shuttle that operates from lake shore center at Austin transportation department to one Texas center to city hall. We can certainly replicate a subtle like that as well, from this new facility to city hall.

[10:33:29 AM]

Currently, our departments utilize the Amanda system, but not every department does that. We are currently implementing that for all departments involved in the development plan process. And so sharing that technology platform, of course, eases with the -- with the multiple locations of some of the departments across the city. And so, of course, you know what we want to do is make sure that what -- with this new location that it's a balancing of those concerns with the other concerns that we have primarily that we are out of space at one Texas center. It's not conducive for providing the very best customer service. Currently the first floor has 7500 square feet of usable space, which is enough to provide a lot of our services on the first floor. Consequently, we operate multiple intake centers, we operate multiple cashier payments throughout the building. What we would like to do is have a single facility with a large enough floor plate on the first floor to where we can consolidate all of those operations to -- into one single platform. Right now, it -- I've got a chart that I can show you where we operate multiple walk-in hours for the different functions on multiple floors because we have to do that because the space is not conducive to operating a centralized floor location like we would like. >> Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. Also what Rodney said, from a locationnal 7th standpoint the proposed location is actually better suited for Austin. The geographic population center of Austin is actually not downtown, it's further north going up towards Koenig lane in the burnet/lamar area. So I'm talking about the population of Austin. It's probably better suited for that location. I can get information from our demographer and provide that information to you. I think the big advantage I see is having another room for public meetings when the old city hall was here and

[10:35:32 AM]

the staff for the planning department, building department were all located, it was very easy for staff to come down, they could continue to do work in their offices and come down to cases as they needed. Also all of the resources were available all within the one building. Obviously, Rodney's staff and my staff can't be located on this property because there's -- there is not enough room today. But it was in the past. So we see a great advantage of that. Also, sometimes we have conflicting meetings, whether the planning commission or the zap or environmental board I think has had sometimes, there's been overlap of meetings in this location and I think having a second location that's easily accessible, that would be close to staff resources, would also serve Austin well in the future. Council alternatively could also have meetings up there as a -- as a different location other than downtown. It would be a good backup, should ever something happen to city hall or something happen to the renovation of council

chambers in the future. >> I share councilmember kitchen's concerns about coordination across policy areas and while I see the definite benefits for the planning departments and the other permitting and whatnot, I am concerned about connections with watershed and Austin energy and transportation which are more located down here. And so you mentioned that there might be some co-location opportunities in the new space. I would like to hear a little bit more about how that works for other departments that are beyond Mr. Guernsey and Mr. Gonzales' purview. >> Certainly and with respect to each of those departments, like Austin energy and like watershed, we do interact with some of their staff. We have recently done coals

[10:37:36 AM]

coalition agreements with more than half of those departments mentioning that we would require co-location of those staff that interact with our staff in the development review process. And so we've already mentioned this to all of the departments that we are looking at a new facility and that we do intend to bring those staff with us to co-locate with us because we do feel that it is important. And we think that the departments would agree that it's important to have all of those staff in one location to provide the services to our customers. Again, our plan is to utilize technology, also for staff that isn't involved in the development review process, but that we may want to have director to director conversations and do that over video conferencing, as opposed to utilizing vehicles to travel between one location and another. We do think that video conferencing is underutilized currently in the city and we think that it's a technology that we -- like Google. You find that Google doesn't have in-person meetings. They have more video conferencing. Sorry about that. Allergies. So we want to replicate that. >> Alter: So you are suggesting that we would have staff who are right now coming down to city hall to have regular meetings with us, they would be doing video conferencing with us and I'm asking that because I do that drive from highland mall, essentially my daughter goes to school over there to city hall every morning, takes between 20 and 30 minutes. Somewhat opposite direction as you may be going. But, you know, in both directions it's taking at least that much time, which is a considerably more amount of time than, you know, five minutes to get across. >> I was referencing with regard to the development plan process. With regard to the other concern, which is the staff that travel to city hall, there are some staff that do travel to city hall. It's not -- we have for instance 360 staff members. It's not all 360 staff members. We can certainly provide a count, but it's not going to be anywhere near the 360. Myself, director Guernsey

[10:39:37 AM]

travel to city hall, we have some other staff that come to city hall for meetings. As I mentioned, the way that that's currently handled by Austin transportation department, for example, they have a location at lake shore. They have a shuttle that goes between lake shore and one Texas center and city hall. We certainly would look at replicating something like that to ease the convenience of traveling to city hall. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I have a couple of questions. I appreciate the concerns about location. I really look forward to -- to the public to hearing from the public on this issue because I'm not sure -- I'm not sure that they are aware that we are considering relocating. I can -- I can bet we will hear some feedback, positive or negative. Or at least questions. And I wonder, as you looked at where the population center was, did you also consider where most of the construction is happening? Because the people who are going to need to be in and out of -- who are already in and out of development services are largely those who are engaged in projects. And so -- so I would be interested in hearing how that they need to do. >> So you are asking -- well, the first part with regard to the public, I personally have made multiple presentations to a lot of our stakeholder organizations, I have mentioned the new facility

on numerous occasions that we are looking at doing that all the way leading to the rfp process. In previous council briefings, I've also mentioned that. Now, we haven't done a direct engagement with the public specifically on the new facility. But it's certainly made mention of it to the public. I think that you probably will get comments if you haven't already with regard to the concern of a new facility. >> Tovo: I think it's different to say we're looking at a new facility, I think that's quite a different discussion than we're moving the development services from one Texas center to highland mall area. I mean, I'm not sure that

[10:41:37 AM]

people knew that until I don't know this week, last week, when it and on our council agenda. So I'm not sure that that piece is out there in the public. Perhaps it is. But where the location is, is really a critical part of the discussion about relocating the services. >> Absolutely. I think that's just part of the rfp process, even though of course the locations came in as part of the rfp, we complaint disclose that until the final recommendation comes out. You are absolutely right. We didn't talk specifically about location because that's part of the rfp process. >> Tovo: I'm saying this is the conversation that we really need to solicit public feedback about right now. It's quite a different matter letting people know that we're looking at a new facility and it's going to make it easier for customer service. Then, you know, again I think people will have a -- have feedback about the location and I'm eager to hear it. >> Sure. I will have to defer to Greg and Lorraine with regard to public feedback. There is a process from this point forward from ones the rfp recommendation comes out to the time that the other party is looking to move forward on the proposal. With regard to your second question, I think that you had asked about companies that are engaged in construction? >> Tovo: No. I think that councilmember kitchen raised a point that came up in our discussion last week as well as in executive session about whether that location was going to be convenient, as convenient as one Texas center is. Because one Texas center seems to be quite central. The answer last week and today is that it is closer to the actual center of the city of Austin limits. I guess I'm asking you a different question. I'm asking where the primary amount of construction and development is taking place and is this as convenient to where most of the construction is happening. I mean I think there are two ways of thinking about it, right? Having it in the actual

[10:43:38 AM]

center of the center as opposed to close to where we have the majority of our development and redevelopment. >> Absolutely. I think Greg wants to -- I think mayor pro tem, I think we have some data that we can pull together and put on heat maps to show currently where the activity of the users of one Texas center are and kind of make that relative. Certainly it is a factor among many -- >> Tovo: I think that would be useful to see. >> Provide it in a way that people with visually see that. >> Tovo: Thank you. Back to the question, councilmember kitchen, I think you said that you referenced boards and commissions. As I understand, you know, part of the design of the building is to accommodate boards and commissions. So I'm not sure that it's a secondary issue. It seems like it's -- it seems like it is an up front issue. I think that that also bears some consideration. You know, when we have boards and commissions members over here sometimes they are stopping into our offices and talking before their meetings. I mean, in my office, my staff sometimes run down to the boards and commissions meetings and watch parts of it. Or talk to our commissioners or people who are gathered for it. So I think moving our boards and commissions or land use boards and commissions out of this building is also something around which we should have significant public comment. I think having it at the center, you know, where we ourselves meet has had some -- has had some important syncoicities with regard to some

actions. >> I wanted to make a few quick points . The first one -- some of this was covered largely in executive session just to applaud the staff's efforts on the cost control measures that this really implements, when we compare this to what it would eventually cost us in bonds and all of the other projects, that it is that we really want to do. I think it's really important for us to balance

[10:45:39 AM]

the concerns that I'm sure we're going to hear from the community about moving locations against the real huge financial benefit. Not just to save us money, but because there's lots of projects that I know we want to work on and being able to get this project at that cost I think is really unique to the locational advantages and competitive advantages that have come out from the highland mall location. So I think that that's something that can't be lost, while we still have to weigh it against other conversations. As far as this being further away from people than downtown, it's certainly further away from some edges of the city than downtown is, but I know that the northern stretches of district 4th, which is actually not as far as some of the northern edges of district 6th and district 7th are, you know, city hall is much further away. As much further away than for those folks than highland mall is from the southern edges of the city. I think that -- and folks from -- know that geography better may be able to help us, but I think frankly highland mall for some folks mind is a northern place, but frankly I think it's like, you know, pretty much right in the middle of the southern boundary and northern bound degree of the city and for -- boundary of the city. For our employees I appreciate that we did a good analysis to show that our employees's travel time is pretty much the same as it would have been downtown. So I'm not here to sort of have a struggle between the northern end of the city and the southern end of the city for location, but frankly highland mall is in many ways geographically a pretty central location and I don't want us to get the word out that we're sending the -- the city operations way into the northern edges of the city bass that's just not the case. I think -- the last part, too, is not just the financial benefit of having a -- of having a building built at this low of cost, but frankly also freeing up

[10:47:41 AM]

some of that, potentially freeing up some downtown land for the projects that the council is looking forward to working on. I know that's a longer range part of our work, but I think that we need to consider all of those things in the balance. I'm not yet at a place where I'm 100% supportive of exactly what the office building would look like if we do it there because I think our action on Thursday if we choose to take it is really the initiation of a process to work with the -- with the development firms to make sure that this is the kind of office building that would benefit city employees, that would potentially benefit boards and commissions if that's the route we choose to go down. Of course there's potential for community benefit for -- for folks nearby because there will likely be office buildings surrounding the highland mall site. I think there's more opportunity if it's a public building for it to provide some good mixes of communities benefits than if it was just a private office building. So I just wanted to sort of lay all of those pieces out there. This isn't some far flung northern location. Second this isn't decided until we've gone through negotiation with the developer and, third, I think we also need to weigh not just the concerns of the move, but also the benefits of -- of the financial savings that we'll see since we do need to expand office space for our employees and the -- and the the potential freeing up of downtown land. >> Mayor Adler: When I look at the factors of the decisions that we made were really clear, black and white, all of the advantages on one side and none on the other because then the decisions would be a lot easier, and I recognize that if you move out of downtown it's -- any direction that you move it's going to be a longer ride for some people and a shorter ride for other people as we would move out of downtown. That's a factor. And I think it is certainly true valid

consideration the fact that our staff, councilmembers interact with the folks there. I think that's real true, too. On the other side of the

[10:49:42 AM]

ledger, most of the people coming in and out of that building are not councilmembers. Or councilmember staff. They are members of the public that are coming in and trying to -- avail themselves of those services. One of the factors, additional factors for me to consider is the fact that we had the study of how we did development services, pointed out that that was one of the things that impacted how we did planning in this city, development in this city, costs associated with doing that in the city. And there were certain recommendations that came to us that -- that this location in that place having gone through the rfp process address. So I think that's an additional consideration. For us to take into account. So there are not real clear answers on this. I do know that one of the reasons why we have the mobility challenges that we have in the city is because we have a higher percentage of people commuting in and out of downtown than just about any other city. I think if you look at the jobs that we have now, people going in and out and we can take something that attracts a lot of people over the course of a day and move it outside of downtown. There's I think an advantage to the city to do that. Certainly takes a -- you know, it's a -- it's just seven miles up 35, but you are doing that at peak hours that's a long trip. So maybe part of making any facility work outside of downtown is taking a look at time management issues and how to make sure that the -- as much traffic as possible is not happening during the peak hour periods. But I think there are obviously for me a lot of

[10:51:45 AM]

factors all over this issue [indiscernible] >> Thanks, mayor, I wanted to weigh in in support of what the staff is attempting to do here. It's actually a little bit less than seven miles, it's more like six if you go I-35. I have driven that a lot. You can also go up north Lamar which is how I go home at the end of the day and it's not onerous. I did have a question because I like the idea of co-locating, this would be for the entire staff, is that right? So all of the permitting functions would be in one place and as literally a one-stop shop, which is the goal that we've been trying to aim toward; is that right? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, that's our goal is to get towards a one-stop shop model. Such that all of the services that are needed by our customers are located there at that building. That was certainly identified in the Zucker analysis from may of 2015 and we've been working in earnest with Greg and Lorraine to try to get to that model through the use of a new facility. We certainly can't do it at one Texas center. As Mr. Zucker pointed out as we know primarily because the first floor is only 7500 square feet, we would end up with the same situation which is multiple touch points on various floors and from the customer perspective it's a way-finding issue. And so it's an older building, it's hard to retrofit because of the way that it's configured. It wasn't configured for us, it was configured for the primary use that was there. This would be a new purpose built facility designed specifically with customer service in mind and how we can provide the very best customer service possible. >> Pool: It's also right close to the intersection of 290 and I-35, so that's also I think speaks in support of it and highland mall did used did an real destination for people in Austin. Let me ask our real estate and our finance staff if we were to turn our backs on

[10:53:46 AM]

this offer, what do you think the situation might be to pursue a similar kind of -- I understand it was pretty creative -- kind of approach that you were taking to locating the financing for this? Do you feel like right out of the box if we were to turn this down or deny it, it might cast a shadow on some

additional efforts that we might have in the future. >> Certainly. We've had this conversation again over the last 18 months, creating this new model again solve both just the -- the issues that are facing us in terms of the space, and then specifically about the type of space we needed for -- for development services and planning. But also the financial model by -- by directly working through competitive model to get at this what we see as significant savings, both lease on demand model and also compared to an additional model. Again saving that will be real. We've had -- we've had some great -- great participation in this model from the -- from the development community and the real estate community. And certainly if -- if we don't -- if this -- if we go off in a different direction, I think we would see a different -- a different -- a different type of response on any future transaction that we would try to go out on. >> Thanks. Mr. Mayor? Renteria thank you, mayor. I have a couple of questions. Ronnie you said you wanted all of your department. If -- is code department going to move into there? Because I know presently there at Cameron road and Rutherford and that's pretty far out there, are they going to be moving in with your -- whatever location we select? >> Right now, code currently isn't involved in the development plan process. They are more on the enforcement end. So the interaction with them isn't as frequent as, say, with watershed or with Austin energy. The space right now isn't to

[10:55:49 AM]

accommodate all of Austin code, it's development services planning and zoning and the particular staff from those other departments that are involved in the plan review process. Know currently the plan isn't to bring the entire Austin code department Renteria the other question is do we own that building there on Cameron and on -- >> Yes, councilmember. We [indiscernible] That a few years ago. >> Okay. Thank you. >> I want to make me clear, my question is not about geography. It's about centering the functions together. We can have a long discussion about where is the center of town and all of that kind of stuff. I just wants to be clear, that may not have been clear when I approximate you the that forward. It's -- when I put that forward. That's why I'm asking the questions, video conferencing is great. I think that's really good. -- So I'm heartened to hear that. It has to be used, of course, if you are not running down the hall to take a minute to talk to your colleague, it can be a little bit of a leap to then make the phone -- the video conferencing call. So anyway I just wanted to be, I want to be very sure that -- that we are focused on centering our functions together. So I want -- I have a few more specific questions then. When we talk about one stop shop, who are we talking about? You mentioned Austin energy, you mentioned watershed, right? Which other departments? >> Let's see. So we have for example parks and recreation. We interact with them. Austin water utility, I don't know if they were mentioned on your list as well. And I don't have the org chart in front of me so I would have to run through, health and human services, they are currently located with us, Austin fire department. There's a section of Austin fire department that is also located with us. >> Kitchen: Okay. What about transportation? >> Austin transportation is currently not located with us. They are located at lake

[10:57:49 AM]

shore. But we would request that the staff that does interact with us on a daily basis that they locate with us, so they are one of the departments that doesn't locate with us. >> Kitchen: Okay. Is there anyone else, other than atd that's not with you right now that you interact with? >> I believe Austin -- well, we mentioned Austin energy. I would have to give you the other list of the other departments that interact with us. [Multiple voices] >> We also do have Travis county. Some of their staff work with us in some divisions as well. >> Kitchen: Okay. Then just to clarify, is the thinking that for every one of these departments, they would -- there would be a subset of those departments -- the folks that you deal with, the subset of those departments that would be co-located with you. >> Yes, yes. >> Kitchen: That

the plan, that's going to happen and there will be space? >> There will be ample space for that to occur. >> Kitchen: Is there an agreement that's going to happen? >> As I mentioned that's what we have in the coalition agreements that we have in these departments is that there would be that co-location and currently the situation that we have is that when we actually want more of those staff, because as they add their staff resources, we don't have the space to add more of their staff. We are literally land locked within the building. >> Kitchen: I understand that you can't stay where you're at. I'm more understanding that we are going down from three options to one option right now. So that's -- that's really I'm just trying to determine is this the one option right now to focus on for this. I think the location is great for -- I'm just asking is this the right department to put in that location as opposed to -- because we have a range of -- of, you know, we have a range of departments that we're going to have to deal with because we have a lot of departments that are leasing now. So -- so my question is, my question really relates to is this the right place for this department so that we have function centering again is what I'm talking about, not geography per se. As opposed to putting other departments there. So those are the kinds of questions that I'm asking. The other thing is that

[10:59:50 AM]

the other thing is I agree with councilmember pool that the financing mechanism is important to maintain, but my understanding is that we were pursuing that financing mechanism regardless of which option we were going forward with. So those are the kinds of questions I had. You've answered a lot of my questions. I am interested in hearing from the public. I think that will be important. And then my final question is, the one Texas center location. I'm sorry you may have told me this. Did you look at using that whole property including the parking lot and just rebuilding the building? Is that one of the options that was thrown out because of cost or whatever? >> Yes, councilmember. We looked at that a couple of years back and we can build a sister tower, but we run into the same situation that would be same floor plates in the building, so it would create the same situation within the planning department. At that, would be to move everybody out of one Texas center, demolish that building and build a bigger building. But then we looked at, okay, now we have over 200,000 square foot over 900 to a thousand employees that we would have to put in lease space for a period of two years. And then the cost to move it back. So when we started looking at the cost and the value of that land, it just made more sense for us to go outside. Plus once we own the land the option that we are currently using, the mechanism to buy this, is not available to us. So for it to be a real estate transaction we need to be buying something. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And one other thing I wanted to let you know is we did look at being closer to downtown. We were just looking at our other options. It's the value of the land to do a large floor plate building downtown, it's just

[11:01:51 AM]

really not feasible unless you go further out. >> Kitchen: Okay well, I understand the difference is, what, 30, 40, \$50 million or something like that between our different options. Okay. Well, all right. I remain concerned, but my concern really is I just want to clarify again it's putting those functions together and to make sure that we don't go backwards on our approach to one-stop shopping is really my concern. And I do want to hear from the public. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan? >> Flannigan: Mr. Guernsey, thank you for pointing out the geography question. On the function questions, councilmember kitchen, because this is a built to suit, this whole conversation about the best way to do planning and development, which department should be there, that already happened, that was already figured out and all the proposals we've been given take into account the best way to provide this service to the community, is that right? >> Yes. The early analysis that Greg and Lorraine did is they did a space

analysis for both of our departments. We provided that information to our -- to Richard Ellis and they utilized that in the proposal that was sent out. It was centered around the two departments and plus the other needs this we have. >> Flannigan: So in any of the proposals we're pulling together the same number of departments and the same number of staff, roughly speaking, right? >> Yes. >> Flannigan: So the difference between the proposals as we get closer to downtown is it necessarily shrinks the footprint because of cost constraints, and I think the difference was closer to \$100 million between going outside of downtown to going inside of downtown, if I remember correctly. I am also very interested in the public input side. Since so much of the use of the building was determined previously, we'll take speakers on Thursday, but there's not much variability here in terms of our decision either to move

[11:03:51 AM]

forward with the plan as it sits or we start over. Is that right? And then if we move forward with this item on Thursday, there's another decision to be made by council in the future, but that one also is yes or no. There's no changes or tweaks or other things that we could do at that point. Is that right? >> Well, councilmember, the six months that we have until June we're going to be actually doing the final design, what we received in our process was conceptual. So if there were some things that we want to tweak in that we still have some time to do that. Because we don't have a final decision at this point. >> So location would be set and the vendor and the builder and the financing model, all that would be set. >> Yes. >> Flannigan: But if we decided that we needed another facility, if we decided that childcare was important, if we decided that certain elements that negotiation could happen between now and the second decision. >> Yes, sir. >> Flannigan: Excellent. I agree with most of my colleagues here. I think that we're talking about trade-offs that the cost difference between putting this downtown and not putting it downtown, I think would be different for other types of buildings. The floor plate thing specifically I don't think is as applicable to some of the other buildings we've all been talking about. We talked about courts and we talk about police stations and we talk about other uses. I think that necessarily puts this outside of downtown. And when you look at where the possibilities are for outside of downtown, this is certainly much more convenient to my district, I can assure you of that, but on the boards and commissions side, we already struggle to get this room scheduled, right? I'm not misremembering that as a conversation at some point. So we need more space for boards and commissions anyway. Putting an option to be centrally located is a good one.

[11:05:52 AM]

It wouldn't necessarily mean that one commission is always there. It would be an option for commissions to decide where they might hold their meetings on whatever their schedule is. So I think on the whole, granted there are trade-offs about staff time traveling between buildings and such, but I think these are the trade-offs we'll be facing no matter where we go. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this item. >> Kitchen: One last confirmation. I want to make sure I heard correctly. On the one stop shop we've already made the decision, right, that these other departments would be co-located. So there's no question that these other departments would be co-located? >> They're currently co-elected with us and we want them to be co-located with us as well. We want to bring more of them that aren't currently located with us. >> Kitchen: My question is not to the ones that are currently located. I'm talking about the whole range for the one stop. >> Yes. >> Kitchen: Are they all committed? >> For example, the coalition agreement with atd, we have not executed that one yet, however it's on the table and they're aware. So I can't answer that question of all committed because we still need to execute that coalition agreement with atd. I can certainly have that conversation with director spillar, but our goal that for

those review staff that are involved in atd that we do bring them over. >> Kitchen: Okay. But the other ones -- is that the only one that's still in process? >> Manager, do you want to comment on that? >> I would. As the city manager over all the departments, I can certainly make sure that that commitment comes from atd and that they work with dsd to co-locate the functions that need to be co-elected. >> Thank you. >> Councilmember, just to answer that, the building was sized when we went through the space programming exercise that led to a response. The building was sized to accommodate that model. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I want to add my

[11:07:53 AM]

thanks to you for looking at innovative financing models and none of my comments and the concerns I've raised and about to raise fly in the face of that. I think you are looking for innovative ways to finance some of our new buildings. But I want the public to understand it's not just a trade off about locations, but what about projects they were under taking a city because there will be a substantial amount of financial commitment to construct this building for development services. And so one, I guess I need to understand a little bit more about the financing and get clarity on some of those numbers. But two, either now or in our discussion on Thursday, we have other building needs here at the city of Austin. A municipal court being one of them, the Daugherty arts center, which has long been needing a place to expand to, and they are in a location where they can't. We have other building needs as well. And I will need to be able to answer to my constituents and others who ask why we've prioritized will construction of what will in the end be an expensive new development services building. Yes, there is significant cost savings using this model, but it is still -- it still comes with a big price tag so I would like to have a conversation about why that's -- why that is a priority over some of the other construction projects that we might undertake. If you could help me understand on Thursday what we're approving is -- or are expenditures that would allow additional work to be done by the chosen firm? That \$650,000 is being financed through debt, is that right? >> That's correct. That would issue upon -- again, I would just walk back a little bit. This would be a real estate transaction to purchase a land and facility once completed the city will not

[11:09:54 AM]

be -- will not be constructing this building as a real estate acquisition. The financing model would allow because of the way we approach the market we did see significant savings over our -- both our lease on demand model and our traditional model around \$50 million. But we would look at ultimately servicing the debt that we issue out of our debt service fund. And certainly as we've talked about there are other projects. In fact, when we updated you back last March, council even approved additional funding for some of the space programming, including Daugherty arts, including muny court. So a lot of that work has been completed. We hopefully expect here soon to be talking more about opportunities with the municipal court. Partly was to try this new model out with the development community that would then achieve significant cost savings was to try out an administrative building as a first cut. It's something that is typically built in the marketplace wildfire we get into something that's more unique in terms of courtrooms or headquarters for public safety or specific arts center. So now that we -- if we have a model that can be successful with the marketplace we believe we're ready to advance the remaining projects and be happy to talk about the status of those, where those are. >> Tovo: And I guess I want to say while there are significant cost savings, I guess we need to approach this as what it is. It is a significant expenditure. And we do currently own one Texas center. So I think there have been some references to the savings on lease space, but it's my understanding that we own one Texas center. So I

assume when we're talking about lease space we're talking about the lease space that would have to be obtained if we were to expand beyond that building. >> >> Councilmember, I want to

[11:11:55 AM]

add that we have 2,000 square foot in lease space right now and the costs have gone up in the last couple of years of at least 30% in downtown area. So -- and we have no way to contain those costs. So that's what we plan on using to pay the debt is use the money that we move out of a lease space in using one Texas center. That's one of the options is to move people as the leases expire, move them into the vacated space at one Texas center. >> Tovo: And will Austin energy -- we lease space for Austin energy. Are they some of the folks that we will relocate to one Texas center as their lease space becomes available? >> We're working on a plan for Austin energy that we're hoping to bring something back to you in the next probably 30 days. >> So as their lease space expires they will not be moving into one Texas center, they have a different solution? >> Just to add to O to what ray mentioned, in addition to the 250,000 of lease space, which is citywide, we will look at opportunities to backfill the space -- of that lease space to move back into the vacated space for services and planning. We would then achieve lease savings that are currently being paid out of people's operating budgets. As we can see is that 250 will exceed from the mark the moveout space of development services and planning mainly because they are overcrowded right now. We need broader areas to work on. On top of that there are additional needs beyond our existing 250 square foot of lease space that we believe that we need in the next year, in the next two years and next years to meet existing staffing issues. So when we look at this cost savings of our lease on demand model is really is both the cost of continuing but in essence we believe that cost will even be higher because

[11:13:57 AM]

of our -- there's additional leases that are being worked through the system just to meet existing demand that we are facing day-to-day right now. Overall with a strategy perfect long-term is to turn those dials and get back into -- get back into owned space. >> Tovo: So I have more questions, but need to stay within the posting language. Let me ask this question and maybe the city attorney can tell me -- I really want to understand -- I appreciate you moving away from lease space. That seems very prudent. So so the 200 -- this may not fly with the posting language, so let me just ask it and then you can say it doesn't or does. We have 250,000 square feet of lease space. How much of that is going to be accommodated in the new proposed development services building. Or by this -- how much will be facilitated by the construction of the development services because you will be vacating one Texas center? >> Why don't I ask these through the Q and a. I guess what I'm trying to figure out is what -- how much of that lease space do we free up by relocating those individuals and those from the other departments and then what are we still -- what are we still looking at. And I am curious about Austin energy, though, that definitely is probably outside the posting language, but as I recall they lease an entire building, so again if we're trying to move people out of lease space, that's pretty close to downtown. I imagine that's high dollar lease space and it would seem to me that's a priority as well. >> Maybe if I can answer that in terms of the space that we currently occupy. We occupy five of the 13 floors at one Texas center

[11:15:58 AM]

between both departments and we could certainly utilize more space. As Greg had pointed out we are bound into one Texas center, but currently it's five of the 13 floors. >> Okay. Thank you. I think that is

somewhat helpful in understanding this. I think too one of the things we have to think about is a lot of the choices and decisions seem to be driven by an interest in having a different kind of floor plan, so that originated I guess in part from the Zucker report? So we're driving a whole lot of decisions, some fairly costly, from one report, which I think had a lot of value, but again it's just one of the considerations I'm weighing. What is the completed -- once completed, what is the total cost of this structure plus the land acquisition? >> Councilmember, we have an estimate right now, but that's what the next four months when we do, we'll get our final and best estimate for that. So that's what -- allowing us to enter into an exclusive negotiating agreement will allow us to get the best pricing. >> Tovo: Is that something we don't want to name today. There have been discussions about how much we're saving and I think -- if it's something that compromises our real estate position I'm happy not to ask it. >> If we could not discuss that right now. >> And a brief correction. It's six of the 13 floors, including -- >> Tovo: Thanks. >> And just to add on, I think as part of that there was a report that was done, but when we started the exercise that was a direct conversation with cbre looking at best practices. We looked at the what some other best practice cities and counties are doing around the country to look at dedicated space that are in these larger floor plates and the impact that it had on their operations I think was very telling and was a good lesson learned for us

[11:17:58 AM]

as an organization. >> I want to say real fast, I think the mayor pro tem raises an interesting question about one Texas center and what happens with that. At some point it would be helpful to have a discussion of that tract. It's part of the south central area. I think there are some questions about whether that can be used for housing. Some questions about whether or not that could be used to help generate greater green space in that development, and certainly as we look at assets that we own downtown because of the value of those assets, they -- we also have to consider what they would leverage for us to be able to do in other places just because of their value. Mr. Casar? >> Casar: As you like any in executive session will present some of the numbers that the mayor pro tem has requested, I think we would compare that to what we would be paying in if we don't move forward with something like that because these employees we'll have them anyway, so just to compare this apples to apples to what it would cost for us to continue to lease space or renovate the space they're in, because ultimately we're making a choice between where we house those employees and the ultimate cost. For me, mayor pro tem, I haven't been super convince bid the floor plan except that it's -- this is an essential function of what we have to do and we have to put these employees somewhere in comparing the various costs, my understanding is that this seems to be a cheaper option, but if you could lay that out for us that would be helpful. And second, my understanding is that moving forward with this does not preclude us from moving forward with new municipal court facilities. So it's not like we're choosing between this and that, is that correct?

[11:19:59 AM]

So -- and that's ultimately because we're utilizing the savings from the lease space to pay -- to pay this off. We're not eating up money that we would be using for municipal court to do this building. >> Certainly -- exactly. The transactions would be separate. Certainly from an overall model -- I think it's a great question about how we move back into one Texas center and that lease savings and how that can be amplified to offset -- augment what we think would be a planned debt payment. We can show you that. Long-term overall we know from a model perspective leasing 250,000 square feet, what we currently do plus another two or three thousand square feet would be much more expensive than a build model. So we can show you that interplay both on the financial perspective, but we see them as

separate transactions. So. >> Casar: For me it comes down to we need a new municipal court facility and we need a space for our employees to not be in leased space and not in cramped quarters and we need to do both. As long as we -- doing one doesn't keep us from doing the other, I think from my perspective we just need to move forward with both of those things. >> And to help the public expectation the item you're talking about is whether or not to go forward with this deal. It sounds like you want a broader conversation and some information from these folks about a plan for everything involved. And that's fine, but on Thursday the discussion will be about whether or not to go forward with this deal. >> I understand. Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: It just is-- as we were talking about investing money in this deal, I think we need confidence in the project and an understanding of how it's planned. And I'm glad to hear you say that all of the projects are going to proceed. They were all initiated more or less at the same time and this has kind of risen and is on the fastest track. So I just want to acknowledge that also the lease savings it sounds like are going to accrue across many different departments,

[11:22:01 AM]

not just development services. So deciding to apply all those savings to one area and one structure is a choice. So I look forward to and welcome the decisions about how we're going to fund the other projects and their timeline as well. >> Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: We have less than 10 minutes before we're going to take the break. Do you want to quickly do your item? Before 5? Equality I didn't get a chance to pull it, but it was item number 5 from the city auditor. And I had a question that I had been working on based on the comments that I had last week about concerns about how as written it was inadvertently moving over to the realm of the separation of powers and just trying to make sure that we were addressing those concerns. So I've been working closely with legal and had a question for Ms. Thomas. And so this is in reference to part K on page 4, which includes a reference to section 9, interference in personnel matters by a member of the city council, a member of councilmember's direct staff or the city manager. And so my question for Ms. Thomas is what would happen if we were to remove the article 9 provision and there was a complaint, what would happen in that situation? >> Councilmember, let me point you to page 8, the functions of the erc, the ethics review commission. Because that is the source of your actual authority. And so this is where -- this is the foundation that we would be looking at. If we remove that provision and it's not there now, so what would happen is what happens now. So as an example if someone felt that a council office was actually interfering

[11:24:03 AM]

with personnel, it would go through the manager line. That person would discuss it with their manager, it would ultimately get to the city manager and the city manager and the councilmember would have a discussion and that's what -- that's how it would work now and that's how it would continue to work if we remove this. >> Alter: Great. Thank you, that's what I wanted to clarify for my fellow councilmembers and I will work with you to write up an appropriate motion moving forward on that. Mayor, if I might just add one thing not on this point because I think after the earlier briefing we might need some good news. I was just texted that we were -- Austin was named the number one best place to live in the country by U.S. News and world reports. So I think that's exciting for Austin. Perhaps not surprising, but as a positive news after what we heard earlier this morning. >> Mayor Adler: Good to jump in front of Denver. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Renteria, did you want to say something about plaza saltillo? >> Renteria: Yes, thank you, mayor. I just wanted to let y'all -- let the councilmembers know that we're still working and negotiating with this item. What my recommendation is and work with the contact team that we're going to go ahead and vote on the first reading only, and my recommendation so far, we are going to have a meeting today at 3:00 with the contact team. And so -- in the metro. So

my recommendations, with the input that I got at the meeting last week with the group was that I want to recommend first reading at 68 because they said that they're willing to give

[11:26:03 AM]

retail at the bottom of all these apartments with 78 feet on the office building. They were concerned about the additional heights, so we're going to meet again at 3:00, like I said, to work out and see what the going to building or -- and just settle for what was first decided on at 78 feet. So that's what I want to make a recommendation. And I just want to let community know also that we're going to discuss this afternoon. >> Mayor Adler: To move forward on first reading? >> Garza: I have a question. First reading right now is written at 125 -- the ordinance prepared now is 125. So are you asking first reading at 125 or you would ask to change it? >> At 78. >> Garza: Can we do it on first reading if staff is not -- and my next question is do we know how that affects? Because being board members, it was a package deal that included living wage and worker protections and there were a lot of moving parts. So how does that affect all of those? >> Renteria: 78 was the amount for the living wage because it originally was set for 60 feet all the way across. And metro requested that we give them 78 so that -- this was just capital. This is capital metro doing it. So they needed the 78 to -- so that they could pay the living wages to their

[11:28:04 AM]

workers. >> Garza: So I'm just wondering where -- there was additional revenue I'm assuming that cap metro we have gotten. So if we reduce to 78 feet that would decrease rental revenue for cap metro is that correct? >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: So -- >> Garza: I guess that's just a concern for -- it's a tough position to be on as a capital metro board member in that the board was depending on that revenue for expansion of services and frequency and all that kind of stuff, which is something that we've really been working on. >> My understanding is that that additional revenue would add up to the four million dollars over four years. It would be like \$100,000 over the first year. So it would go up to 125. >> Garza: Okay. I'll talk to cap metro and see how this all -- what it means for their budget. >> Mayor Adler: My understanding with respect to this is there was a question about posting language and whether we could make it taller or shorter and the sequence. If there was a difference if we did it on second reading versus third reading, but my understanding is with the posting language we have we could move the height up, not move the height up and there's no limitation between first or second and second and third. We could just act as we deem appropriate, is that correct? >> That's correct, as long as [indiscernible]. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes. >> Pool: Real quick. Two items. Item 30 I'd like to pull and I'd like -- this is the lowering of the speed limits on some sections of north Lamar boulevard around Parmer around morrow and down a little bit further south, oak Brooke drive. I would just like to find out from staff, this is the if it was a December meeting,

[11:30:05 AM]

it was December to have our staff talk to txdot and see if we could lower the speed limits five miles per hour additional to what they were posting. I would like to get some feedback on that because I haven't gotten any different information. And the backup just is the same letter that we had gotten in October. So that's item 30. And then on item 48, which is the 1301 Koenig lane zoning case, my understanding is - - and I don't see Greg here or Jerry to confirm this, but staff will request a postponement. There's some issues on the floodplain elevation with regard to the structure that haven't yet been ironed out, so staff will be asking for a postponement. >> Mayor Adler: This is number 48? >> Pool: 48. >> Mayor Adler: Let's see if we can confirm that when we come back. Council, it is just before 11:30. We're going to

November 2015. And we are not asking the council to make any decisions at this point. It's simply an update. Much has transpired since that time around the issues of the convention center expansion. We've gotten additional

[1:47:39 PM]

direction from the council on related action to include the visitors impact task force that was created to look at the hotel occupancy tax and ways to increase revenue from hotel occupancy taxes. We've also have noted the discussion that has been on the council message board about the vision for downtown and particular the eastern portions of downtown and other areas either contiguous or in the vicinity in which the convention now exists in other portions of the downtown area. I believe you have an item on your agenda, item 33 related to that conversation. So today's scope of that presentation is limited to that initial direction we received back in 2015. We will be including some of the outcomes from the visitors impact task force study and other conversations in the future, but since it's been more than a year since we've had this formal conversation, we wanted to provide you this update. With that mark tester, the director of convention center, is with me along with his assistant director, Carlos Stephen and I'll turn it over to Mr. Tester at this time. >> I'm mark tester, directs either of the convention department. I'm excited to continue the conversation regarding our long range plan. I'll go over the background regarding what we've been doing the last three years as well as hit on some of the community stakeholder engagement that we went through as well as what we will be doing. And deputy director Carlos Stephen will be going through the opportunities and the impacted plan and the findings and I'll wrap up with the next steps. Again, we've been at this for quite awhile. In March of 2014 we engaged againstler to develop the long range master plan. And really the three major things that we're looking to accomplish with the plan was number one was to justify if an expansion was warranted. Number two is if the

[1:49:40 PM]

expansion was warranted where would it go in and around the facility. And three, what suggestions would be needed or wanted in and around the area as part of the district. And I think that's a good portion of the conversation today. Just a reminder again, this is a long range plan. Any pictures you see of the building are just samples of what can be done. We have not hired an architecture or architect or done anything like that. This is really just the starting point. In addition to the long range plan, council did request that we work with the urban land institute in April of 2015 we went under the technical assistance panel and I'll cover what we found from that. And then of course mark mentioned the November 12th, 2015 council resolution that we call the 14 point resolution, which work has now been completed. The summary really of our master plan is that there's five factors that meeting planners routinely consider when looking at a destination. And the five factors are convention centers, hotel inventory, security, safety, transportation, accessibility and attractions and activities. And the destination is encouraged to always solve for the weakest link. And the thing we found out now as our city has continued to grow is now the convention center really is the weakest link of that five. Due to our size we now are the smallest and oldest of our competitive set. And also the older side of the convention center has ample enough meeting rooms, but they're very small and it really is limiting our ability to maximize the size of the groups that we can put into the building. But we are a practical occupancy. Practical occupancy in the convention center business is 65%. We are now there. We are absolutely as busy as we can be. Of the five -- of every 10

[1:51:40 PM]

groups that we bid on through the acvb and we bid on, now five of those 10 is because we're too small or unavailable. And the plan considered five different options, south, north, west, whatever, and the most opportunity to do the most economic impact was to the west non-contiguous. One of the things is with that amount of lost business that we're now losing, that absolutely will fill the building up. We're not extrapolating demand. When we expanded the convention center in 1999 we said if we do this, we're going to -- this is what-- we're going to build demand. The hotels will come. The restaurants will come. Airport will grow and that certainly did occur. But the demand is there. We will be filled with the business that we're now losing. Again, urban land institute did a technical assistance panel. In April of 2015, it was to provide leadership and the responsibility use of land in creating sustaining, thriving communities. They also concurred that expansion was justified. They did agree with our west non-contiguous expansion. They also encouraged us to do some really great things around the neighborhood and do what they called a convention center district. Really flying in the whole area and it really encouraged us is if we needed to find additional ways to make the dream real to look at raising hotel occupancy tax higher than it currently is. And Carl will be presenting some of those options today. And the other thing they encouraged us electronically to do is purchase land right now because the land could be gone. Of course that's almost two years ago that they made that request of us. We have as of yesterday handed out -- I see a few binders at your side.

[1:53:41 PM]

The 14-point resolution that we'll have responses to all 14 points, in addition, we engaged industry experts Steven Hacker. He is the president and former CEO of the exposition and events, a convention and trade show spent, has both reviewed our long range plan as well as the 14 points and did really a white paper audit. It is a fairly lengthy read, but very, very interesting. And it really highlights why expansion is necessary and the growth and trends in the industry as a whole. In addition, there will be the discussion and illustration of the financing concepts, which Carl will be discussing, also a preliminary traffic analysis along with some points and other O owe some powerpoints and other things we've done throughout our conversations in the community. We have been engaged in significant amount of community engagement during the whole process including receiving support from downtown commission on our plan. We appreciated councilmember Houston and Renteria allowing us to have a public meeting in districts 1 and 3 and thank you to mayor pro tem tovo and the mayor for coming and joining us on that day. We're about 100 austinites came and really wanted to find out what we're doing. We will continue to do that. Again, I mentioned that we have not designed the convention center and so if in fact you did let us move forward, we would be doing significant community engagement to really find out what exactly the community needs, and that will continue really throughout the whole process. With that I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Karla to talk about really what we've heard about this process with the different components for the area and then she will get right in and do a deeper dive on financing.

[1:55:41 PM]

>> Thank you. So we did take all of the input that we've received from the various community and stakeholder discussions and we went back and combined that with the needs that we had identified in our plan. And the third component that kind of brings this altogether and helps define the path forward is the financing and the capabilities that that would bring. So just to remind everybody what we have heard, a lot of this was discussed in the plan and again at the various community engagement efforts, but we certainly heard from the very beginning do not build another big box. That's not what the the

community had interest in seeing at all. So within the new facility we would be looking to incorporate community space, create it so that it has open and walkable space that's not a four or six block structure that you have to walk all the way around. We certainly heard both in the plan and with you and again community is that the street level of of this facility needs to be active with something more than just convention center space. So restaurant, retail space incorporated. We've also had discussions with other city departments. And two of the needs that have identified themselves that we believe might be doable within this facility and create solutions is with the Austin fire department and their need for a new downtown fire station. We also had conversations with Austin energy. They needed a second downtown chiller facility. When we constructed the fifth street garage for the convention, part of that was in connection with Austin energy and we have a chiller on that footprint and we would be looking to find a solution within this facility to bring another chiller site to meet that need. We also heard that we needed to look for ways to not only incorporate into the facility footprint, but what could we do in the bigger

[1:57:42 PM]

area around the convention center. And again the financing concepts will dictate what we could do depending on the financing that we would go with, but certainly there is potential for this program to incorporate area improvements. One example is the waller creek area, the palms school. We know that the city and county are currently in discussions on what that could potentially become. That could be a component that is incorporated into this convention center complex idea. We also have some historic homes on red river that are currently part of the convention's facility and we are looking to see -- the convention extra facility and we are looking to see what we could do to make those into a more viable and vibrant option. Again, we've heard over and over what could we do to find additional funding of hotel occupancy tax for the other allowable uses, cultural arts, tourism and promotion, historic preservation. And one of the financing options actually does speak to that need as well. So we took what we've heard and we then revisited what our needs were to make sure that moving forward we develop a program that meets everybody's needs, just reminding you the industry and convention center needs that we would hope to be solving or preserving is keeping the industry itself, the visitor industry, strong. It is the fourth largest employment sector currently in Austin. That industry does offer a diversified economy and provides economic impacts to both small local businesses and even the city's general fund today through sales tax that the visitors pay when they're here spending money. So certainly the convention center plays a part in that industry and we need to be mindful of those needs of that industry. The overall industry continues to have a need to meet. Adult education is ongoing, professional organizations continue to meet. And the convention center is

[1:59:42 PM]

a site where those things happen. Again, looking back at what the plan actually found is we need space to continue to meet those needs. As mark indicated, today's lost business would fill that expanded space. So when we look at what we heard through community and what our needs, we then layered in the financing options. This slide gives you a high level overview of the two main options that we've identified and I'll be going into greater detail. But there are two main concepts that we've identified. One of them is the venue option through chapter 334 of the Texas local government code. The other one is a two percent assessment under chapter 351. So this gives you a summary and I will go into greater detail in the next slides. The first option is the venue option under chapter 344. It is the option that our current expansion that we completed in 2002 was financed by. This is replicating what we did back then. It is the option that is discussed in the plan. It would require if we move forward with this option to handle the current venue debt in some way. Either a refinancing, refunding or redefinition of

that debt. This option would require voter approval, so we would be going to the voters to seek approval, redefine or extension of the venue. This option does have some debt capacity limits, so all of the components that we identified might not be doable under this option, giving our preliminary project estimates. Under this option the hotel occupancy tax would remain at 15%, its current rate. And in doing so, that leaves the 2nd% venue option for the county to purview if they were looking to pursue an eligible product or room for the tourism public

[2:01:43 PM]

improvement district taking us to a rate of 17%. Under this option, all convention center revenue streams would be pledged, including the hotel occupancy tax and our facility revenue in order to maximize the debt capacity. If this option were pursued once the -- once the new venue expires, whatever -- whatever the venue is defined as will limit what the revenue can be spent on. That's the first option. Yes? >> Mayor, can I just ask a clarifying question. In the book, this is all really helpful and I look forward to working through it here today, but in the book you have identified options as 2 a, 3 a, 4 a, can you -- >> I will explain that, yes. >> Tovo: Okay. So the option that you are describing right now is -- is one of those or no? >> The option that I am describing now is -- is options 2nd, 3rd, 4th in your book. Those are variations of the same -- those are -- right, variations of the same. I'll get to the handout at the end of the presentation, I'll walk through a couple of pages and explain how those differ. >> How those match up, okay. >> Yes. So the second option that we identified, we actually identified after the plan was drafted and released. So this one is not discussed in the original plan. But chapter 351 allows certain municipalities of which Austin is one to increase the chapter 351 hotel occupancy tax up to an additional 2nd%. Chapter 351 -- designates, though, that this additional 2nd% can only be used for expansion of an existing convention center. So that would be the only allowable use of that funding. What this does, though, is give us an opportunity, because of the higher debt capacity that this would result in, gives us an opportunity to include some of the other components that

[2:03:45 PM]

the venue option wouldn't -- wouldn't have allowed us to do. This option, under chapter 351, would require council approval as opposed to voter approval. And depending, it doesn't have to be a full 2nd% increase, so council could choose to do a 1st%, 1st, any variation, depending on what that ultimate increase would be would determine the debt capacity and the extent to which the other components could be included. If council were to decide to raise the tax 2nd%, the hotel occupancy tax limit would increase to the legal allowable limit of 17%, only until the current venue would expire either in 2029 or earlier, I will show you how that would work in some of the options. The concept would define the path and timing of the ability to pursue another venue or a tpid or any combination thereof. As with the first option, we would be pledging all of our revenue sources to maximize the debt capacity. This is the option that we have identified that does have potential for additional annual funding for any of the other allowable uses of the hotel occupancy tax, I will show you thereto flow of funds where we believe there's potential for -- for increased funding for the arts or historic preservation or any of the other legal uses. The 17% is the maximum of the 351, if you did a tpid, running the balance of the venue, you could get to 17 -- conceivably put a tpid on top of that. >> Yes, we believe we can.

[2:05:46 PM]

Yes. When we were analyzing the financing concepts, we did seek consultation with the city's financial services department, we worked with the cfo's office and both the city treasurer. We also worked with

pfm group, the city's financial advisor. We ran scenarios under both options, debt capacities under both options. Pfm group has used very conservative revenue projections because it's considered one of the most volatile revenue sources. When you are looking at long-term financing, conservative estimates are required. Pfm has indicated that the financing concepts that we have included in the binder and that I will go over in more detail are viable options for the city to consider. For this page you do have a supplemental handout. Again on the slides it's unreadable. But I want to direct you to that supplemental handout at this time. This is what's included in your binder that mayor pro tem referenced. This first page is actually just trying to orient the reader how to read the remaining pages. So the key or actual the text box, textbooks along the outer edges of this page. As you are going through the pages, the -- the header section of each page will describe for you what the option on that page is illustrating. It gives you the -- the tax -- the law under which the tax would be assessed. The debt capacity that's being estimated, whether or not it's voter, council approval. Then there's the box on the right that -- that kind of gives you what the project would actually include. Those elements that that debt capacity based on our preliminary projections could include. There are then boxes on the left-hand side that have the blue arrows, that is illustrating a single year's worth of -- of flow of funds so that you can get an idea of what it means to pledge all of these revenues to the

[2:07:48 PM]

debt. The estimated revenues that would come in and then the -- the uses that would come from the flow of funds within the bonding document. Flow of funds is a typical component of a revenue bond, official statement. It actually outlines how -- how and what order you spend the money. So we're illustrating what those flow of funds would look like. Then at the bottom of each one of these pages we describe what this -- what this financing option will -- how it will impact the other components of hotel occupancy tax in terms of who could do a venue and when or what impact it might have on a tourism public improvement district. So that orients you to the page. What I want to do today, not go over every one of them, but I'll go over option 1st, which is the venue option and then one of the remaining option when is just a variation of the chapter 351 option. So if you look at option 1st awn the venue option, using today's current market, today's revenue projections and the preliminary project budget, we've -- we've estimated that a project budget under the 35 -- or 334 option could get to about \$400 million of project budget. We think that that could certainly build the building and offer the components within the facility that we mentioned, the community space, the open and walkable area, the restaurant and retail. But we don't believe that this project budget allows for a lot of the other components. The area improvements, the underground parking, the plan actually offers up for an example a rooftop park. We are not sure this option would have a project budget that would allow to incorporate all of those things. When you look at the boxes on the left-hand side with the blue arrows, it shows the pledged revenue that's coming in, how that would be used to cover debt service, to cover the convention center operations.

[2:09:48 PM]

Then the remaining funds flowing into an ending balance for capital improvement project fund. Again, because this is a venue option, the funds can't be used outside of the rental view, so this is -- outside of the venue, this is how the funding would be used in this option. A reminder it's not taking the tax up about 15%. When you see below the line, the county could pursue a venue today under this option if you didn't want to go above 17% you could do a mid mid and -- that's what this option gives you. The second one that I want to go over today is actually option 2 B. You will explain what the remaining pages look like. Options 2nd, 3rd, 4th, all variations of the chapter 351 tax. Option 2nd is if council approved

taking the tax up to 2nd%. Option 3rd shows the scenario of if you only decided to take it up 1st%. Option 4th shows a scenario of 1st%. You can slice and dice that 2nd% any way that you want it. We are trying to give you an idea of the impact of what the change in those percentages give you. Within each option there is an a and a B. The a option leaves the current venue debt in place through 2029 when it is set to expire. That's what the a option is showing you in terms of project funds and flow of funds. Option B is actually planning to retire that debt early. We've targeted the year 2021. When we believe through this financing and through the -- through the revenues that are coming in, we could retire that debt early. So I'm using option 2 B as the example, but that's the differences.

[2:11:49 PM]

The tax through chapter 351 but just shows you there are many ways that we could move forward with that, with that concept. Option 2 B, again, would raise the chapter 351 tax up 2nd%, but it would also seek to retire the current venue debt in 2021. Raising the tax to 17%, only until 2021 when the venue debt is paid and the venue then expires. This gives you about a 600 million-dollar project fund. You can see in the box in the right-hand side it shows not only the facility with the open and walkable community space on street level, but we believe then there would be funding for the underground parking if we wanted to incorporate that in the building and again some concept of a rooftop park or venue on top. It also shows the additional area improvements that we believe could become part of a convention center complex. So if we were trying to incorporate [indiscernible] For instance, again it would become part of the convention center complex, which means there would need to be a visitor component to it, but there certainly could be perhapsing or plans to offer that -- programming or plans to offer that as a community asset as well. Those historic homes that are part of the convention center today, we would be looking to see what we could do with those homes, turning them into a creative village. We've heard that there would be a need for more art space. Again, there would be a visitor component to it. But we believe that could become a community asset as well. Then we have also heard, you know, the areas around brush square. We haven't definitively defined what any of these other elements would be, but we believe there's potential for them to be part of this project. Again, as I mentioned, are the Austin fire station and the Austin energy chiller, obviously, we would be looking to incorporate those

[2:13:50 PM]

in the overall project as well. So you see on the left-hand side with the boxes with the blue arrows, there are more boxes in this option because this is not a venue option. So you see now there are four revenue sources that are coming in because again this is depicting, I choose the first full year of debt service as my example. So the current venue debt is still in place in this year. So you will see the four revenue sources coming in and then we would use the funds to pay debt service first, the convention center operations and then funding ending balance and capital improvement projects, but then this option, because we have to build in excess to meet debt capacity requirements for -- for revenue bonds. You see that this option allows for excess. That in this year could offer about \$7 million that council could -- could direct for any other -- for any legal use of hotel occupancy tax. Now, I have included here as an example \$3.2 million could go to -- to allowable cultural arts funding. We have certainly heard there's a need to -- to try to help the red river district, for example. Again, these are all just examples of what council could ultimately decide to spend this money on. The cultural arts funding is still capped at an overall 15% of the chapter 351 tax, but because we have raised the 351 tax this is what's allowing the additional arts funding. Again, you would have additional funding directed towards historic preservation,

tourism, promotion, activities or any allowable use. Because we are for about four years taking the tax rate up to 17%, this would delay the ability of the county to pursue a venue. If they were wanting to

[2:15:50 PM]

pursue a venue, the earliest they could do so under this scenario would be in the year 2021. Again, we show that there is consideration for the tpid. Again, it not legally restricted to stay below 17%, but if there was not a desire to go above 17%, then this shows how this would impact it. So the other options that are included in your binder in the supplemental handout, all read the same way. But I wasn't going to go through every one of them. I just wanted to give you an introduction to what these pages were. Let you go back and study them and then certainly we'll answer any questions. I will turn it back over to mark so he can tell you what our next steps are. >> Thank you, Carla. Now that you have our binders and the presentation, we know there's going to be a lot of questions as you do your deep dive. We're here to respond to all of those here and into the future. We are actively engaged with the visitor impact task force and we will continue to support them and the variety of questions that they have as we go through that process. Of course, with council direction we will work within the larger downtown vision as it expands to include other elements and look to make sure that downtown is the best that it can be certainly look to continue the community stakeholder engagement. We are very excited about another public meeting, with the mayor pro tem tovo, agreed hopefully to host. We have invited the county to come and hopefully sit down and start that dialogue about palm school, we would really like start the dialogue. Eventually we hope to bring the council back -- the plan back for future approval. With that I'll go ahead and open up any questions that you may have of us. >> Houston: First of all, I want to thank you all in the difference in attitude and presentation since the first time we met. You all have done a

[2:17:51 PM]

remarkable job over the last two and a half years, trying to get the community engaged to listen to what the needs of the community are and try to responds to those. Also an amazing job of giving us funding options that perhaps we hadn't thought about before. Of course I'm always excited when I see the Travis county expo center someplace as a potential venue because that's something that we're going to have to address at this point. But I just want to say thank you for all of this information. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I echo those thanks. This is very interesting, a lot to think about. I know that you're right, that we likely will have lots of questions about this. I wonder is it best to address those through the budget process? That way those questions can be available to all of us? The questions and the responses can be available to all of us? What would make sense in terms of a format for asking questions about -- about the financing options that are in the book? >> We can certainly use the budget q&a format, because that pushes the data out to the community. So that all can see it. I think that may be better than the q&a for the council meetings because they won't all be in one place. So you are welcome to use that forum. >> Tovo: Sounds great. Thank you for mentioning the -- the upcoming council -- the upcoming public meeting. I just wanted to give a little bit more details on that. At this point I think we're just about to finalize it scheduled for February 25th. As some of you know, commissioner Gomez from Travis county is leading a work group to collect feedback and look at possibilities for palm school and councilmember recipient and I serve on that. -- Renteria and I serve on that. I know she intends to be present. Part of the purpose of the meeting will be to collect feedback about palm school. I know judge Eckhardt plans to be there, I think Travis county commissioners court may post this as a public meeting.

[2:19:51 PM]

We may if there's enough interest for council need to do the same for city council as well. The downtown Austin alliance is planning to be there as part of our -- our Austin stories, I think is the project that they are initiating. So thank you, I think it will be an interesting opportunity to talk about different elements and for the public to ask questions, too, about the different financing scenarios and different design elements that you discussed. So thank you. >> Mayor Adler: In case you are taking a poll, I would hope to be there. So maybe that there's enough interest to go ahead and post it. >> Renteria: I also want to thank you all for sitting down and listening to us because we do have some very historic buildings right around that waller creek and the investment that we also are putting into the waller creek, so with seeing the big picture like it is, that we have a lot of opportunity to connect within all of the Mexican American cultural center with the palm, palm park, then the convention center. I think this is going to be an exciting project if we can get this off the ground. >> To that end, we have a -- we have -- we have tons of information. So that all of the information that -- could be out relative to waller creek, and the potential for 150 to \$200 million there, the opportunities that might enable us to fund the mac, also waller creek park, communities for a long time, a lot of folks up on this dais have been working on the homeless situation and the arch, trying to see if there's a way that we can get that facility to just handle what that facility was intended to do or whatever it is. That is appropriate stakeholder response. We have an item on this agenda on Thursday, I think

[2:21:52 PM]

it's like 37 or something like that, that -- that the mayor pro tem and councilmember Houston and I think councilmember troxclair and I put on the agenda to also get that additional information so we can take a look at those pieces, too. Further conversation? Discussion about this? Okay. Thank you very much. Hold, hold on. >> Tovo: I'm sorry, I want to verify what were the options that you most recommended? I thought maybe I heard you say at the beginning that there were a couple of options that you particularly recommended. >> I don't think that I used the word recommended. >> Tovo: Okay. I may have misunderstood. >> I just targeted two for today to give you an introduction to what the pages cover. Certainly if staff has asked for a recommendation at some point, we will bring forward which one of the options we believe meets the most needs. >> Tovo: Thank you. You did actually do a very good job when you were discussing the options of clarifying that those were examples that you were walking us through. I didn't take those to be recommendations. I just misassumed, misunderstood your comment at the beginning that you were providing us with information about which option that you recommended. But thank you for laying out all of these different ideas and, too, from incorporating what you have heard from council about our interest in some of the other historic properties in that area. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Council, that gets us to the last two items that we have. I think that at 2:30, most of the -- most of the acms and the city manager are going to be leaving to go off-site. Because they have a hard stop. But Robert Goode is going to stay with us. I think the mayor pro tem has a hard stop at 2:45.

[2:24:01 PM]

We have item 34 and 35. I pulled both of those, 34 was to give us an opportunity to discuss it. Councilmember troxclair also pulled item no. 35, we had written that in a non-prescriptive way asking for staff to take a look at best practices and come back to us with their recommendations and investigate options would be. Does anybody want to discuss these options. >> Tovo: I do, but I see councilmember troxclair's light is on. >> Troxclair: I wanted to mention I'm sorry I'm going to have to leave for a meeting, but I -- but I was -- I'm generally supportive of the changes that have been

suggested both to the council committees and to the -- to the council meetings. I -- I particularly wanted to mention as far as having earlier deadline for agenda posting, I know sometimes when we don't have agendas posted, not only is it better for us to have more time and digest and ask questions and the public to react, et cetera. My staff often ends up working the weekends if the agenda is posted on Friday and we have to have pulled items by 4:00 on Monday. So I know that would allow them more time to get through -- get through the agenda. I had one suggestion just to throw out there, if we were going to create -- or redo the proposed committees, if we're going to obviously maintain the Austin energy committee, to potentially consider just having that as a utility committee, so that if there were just considering the Austin water is a significant portion of the city's budget and a huge the ability to kind of have a venue to discuss water issues. If and when they come up. And I'm trying to see if

[2:26:02 PM]

there is anything else that I wanted to mention before I have to -- leave. I mean, I -- I would -- these are all just I guess more minor details. But my preference as far as the mayor choosing basically appointing committee membership based on the input from committee members as well as choosing a chair or vice chair, I think is how it's done in other legislative bodies and I think would make the most sense for the city to continue doing as well. Thank you for letting me make those comments. I will go back and watch the video when I get back. >> Tovo: Is not clear since we're going to be losing members, me here soon. We've had a couple of discussions about committees and the changes that have been brought forward, I think, recognize significant points of consensus as well as some that we discussed but maybe didn't have a consensus about. And there may be more discussion to have happen. But with regard to 35, these are for the most part issues that we haven't talked about in this body together and so I really feel the need to do that before I vote, even if it's prescriptive, starting the council meetings earlier is still a shift from what we were doing. I think it would make sense to have a discussion before we ask the staff to come forward -- it's not really clear what we are asking them to do. Go forward and come back with recommendations about making the council meetings early, that's pretty -- pretty -- there aren't multiple options there. Earlier it's the same time or it's later. So I guess I would prefer if we actually had discussions about the bullet points on

[2:28:04 PM]

this list to see where there are points, where there are. Places of consensus or get ideas or -- or whatnot before we ask the staff to go forward and bring us back best practices related to these. I think we should talk amongst ourselves first today or Thursday. Though today we're pretty limited. >> Pool: I would echo elements of what the mayor pro tem said about item 35. I just -- I spent a little bit of time with these today and they are based on things that you had put up on the message board previously. I've -- back to item 34, I was hoping that we could assign ourselves to committees, that we -- I'm waiting to see who wants to be on what committees. And where I should put my energies to. I know one committee that I'm interested in chairing, but I haven't yet decided when other committees that I would -- that I would indicate an interest in okay. Some of that is based on how many people are which committee. So that we can have a good array. So I did want to move a little bit forward on us self-identifying what committees we want to be included on. >> Flannigan: I posted on the council message board and I handed out today an alternative exhibit more so as a discussion item. But as I read through the work on the proposed committee changes I felt that it wasn't entirely clear, but still the point. The purpose of the committee is it felt like we were slightly scaling back a system that there seemed to be consensus wasn't working. I had some other issues with it too, but I wanted to put together an alternative proposal for

committee structure. And this would be to align our committees to the strategic outcome work that we did earlier in January,

[2:30:06 PM]

that it makes it I think significantly clear the purpose of committees that they would not be about posted agenda items. That they would be in partnership with commissions so we could leverage commission meetings and input taken at commissions, and those appointees sitting with us in a situation much like this, we could work on longer term issues. We could more easily digest strategic planning, think about long-term issues, think about opportunities. And then our committees would be lined up to flesh out all of the indicators and will remaining detail that our consultants working on to come back to us. I think there's also a long-term role to look at monitoring those indicators and thinking about not just issues, but opportunities to improve those metrics over time, but I think the key here is that the committees here that I'm referring to as standing committees, there's some -- obviously some devil in the details that's not here so that's why it's bullet points and not ordinance language, but the concept here is that we would have committees aligned to these outcomes, working on long-term issues and opportunities, giving extra value and work and purpose to our commissions to participate in that process. That it would be the meetings where there was not public testimony, so public testimony would still be taken at commission meetings and of course at our formal council meetings. I'd prefer to keep the membership of committees at four members so that we avoid the quorum rules. I had some fairly significant concerns with the exhibiting proposal about at least five members and that the committee meetings agendas would be posts a if they were council meetings to take action, and the phrase to take action was mentioned several times. In current proposal I think that the committees should serve a different purpose than that. The task force idea is more so that just --

[2:32:07 PM]

in addition to the six standing committees that we might find ourselves in a task force situation. I think that might be unfortunately councilmember troxclair set the way, but I think we might find ourselves more aligned to rate case timing doing a task force/ad hoc committee around whatever utility is up for the big review, which I think is different than where we used to be four or five years ago where it's not so clearly on a five-year cycle with our utility reviews. I also agree with councilmember troxclair that I think it's simpler, much like with boards and commissions, that nominations are made by individual, in this case the mayor in that it's a standing committee, but the whole list say proved by the full council. Obviously to move this to an ordinance would require a lot more detail written, but I think that's where I would like to see staff take a stab at the actual detail, like the mayor's put together on the meetings process itself. That's what I've put together here in this alternative exhibit. Like I said, it is also posted on the council message board and posted at about 8:00 A.M. This morning. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza? I guess I'll start with 34. I think that's the committee one. This was an attempt to scale back. I think the mayor agreed that it's a stopgap. I agree it was. It was an attempt that -- the the way the ordinance is written right now we need to have certain meetings and I think we all agree that some committees are not useful and we don't want to be in violation of the current ordinance that says we're supposed to have a certain number of meetings for these committees. So -- and we had some discussion during -- I guess the last time we talked about this, but once we -- that strategic outcome is still in the process of being laid out. So I believe we were told March or months from now

[2:34:08 PM]

we'll get the final. I think at that time then it's a good opportunity to look back and see if the committees that we've created or changed line up or how we can better line those up. But this was an attempt to get some efficiencies in place as soon as possible. And so I hope we can continue down this path that several of us have been trying to work on to create more time to be able to do -- to be doing other things that we would rather prioritize than sitting in committee meetings for two hour briefings, getting the same two hour briefing at a council meeting and it's just created so many inefficiencies. So that would -- that's my response to that one. Beyond that I -- I guess it bothers me that we keep comparing ourselves to the other and other bodies because we're not other bodies. We're different. We're the Austin city council and I would prefer appointments have been done that way in the past, but there seems to be this move to change the way everything was done in the past, and not everything that was done in the past was a bad thing. It was -- it worked and it's my understanding that before the council as a whole decided who was on what committee and I think that's the way we should continue to do it. It's the collaborative different approach to do things. And I would prefer it to be that way. I think that there were discussions when we started this that all of us were comfortable with the mayor doing this because we were all new and frankly then I didn't think the mayor should be doing it, but I understood it and I supported it. But I think it's a different situation now. And while we do ratify it as a whole, that would just be really weird, I think. It would -- it could create

[2:36:10 PM]

unintended consequences to people being appointed to certain things. And I'm not saying that that happened before or any mayor would ever intend to do that, but it could -- I'm always concerned about putting a process in place and how it plays out 10 years from now with some situation 10 years from now and how that plays out. So I would -- and I thought we talked about, those of us who have been working on this, how that would happen. Probably in every case there's probably four or five people and they're the only ones who want to serve on that committee. It wouldn't even be an issue. I would prefer that process. With regards to 35, I don't -- again, you know, I understand wanting to do things differently, but I don't know where we're so concerned about being prescriptive. I've said this a million times. That's our job. We go around and ask people to support us because we believe in a certain thing and we have opinions. You know, we have strong opinions of things. And this just seems very-- I don't have anything against staff giving us recommendations. I appreciate their recommendations all the time, but considering starting council meetings earlier, so then what's the process in that? Either you -- is staff going to go back -- is staff going to come back and say we considered it and we think you should start at 10? I don't see how this gives any direction to staff. And if there are -- if there are councilmembers that want it to start at 9:00, write that, council meetings should start at 9:00. And you get six votes, council meetings with start at 9:00 then. That's the process. This is just so vague and I don't know how it gives any direction to staff. I would prefer something that's -- convene a task

[2:38:11 PM]

force or a subcommittee that looks into this and considers all these things and brings back recommendations, but just to hand this over to staff and say bring us some recommendations, I don't feel comfortable giving what I believe is very little direction. >>> Mr. Casar? Scar I won't speak to 65 yet because I just want to speak on the committee item previously. First I think that we tried -- to councilmember Flannigan's point, tried to last in our redo of the committee work, tried make sure we're focusing on long range planning in the committees and not as much items that council doesn't want to hear quite yet. And I think whatever we can do to continue to make that clear I'd be very open to including that. That's the first point for me. The second point, I think one of the most important things

for me in this sort of committee redo process is what councilmember kitchen has been talking about insofar as bylaws or charters so that we just ensure that as the consultants mentioned, the committees are doing the work that the council would like to have dedicated away from -- delegated away from them. First that we're working on long range planning and second that the council is comfortable about delegating other things. I think that's the first most important parts this. I think it will happen more by culture than ordinance change and that's why I keep repeat repeating those two parts. On the question of who makes the nominations for the committees, for me I don't model R. Model it -- it's not to model it on the legislature or any other body. I just think that it's a lot cleaner to have one person put up the list. I understand that with the prior group of seven, councilmembers had a smaller group of people to shuffle around, but now that it's at

[2:40:12 PM]

11, it really seems to me that instead of having an ifc from four members putting together a list of councilmembers and potentially four other members having another list, it just seems to me to be clean cut for the mayor to put a list up and then for us to have comment on it. It's not a -- -- I just think it seems cleaner and less messy to have different council offices trying to put together the list. We still have the authority to vote it up or down. But that's just my two cents on that point. And I'll reserve comments on number 35. I do agree with making some of those changes and have some reservations about others. And happy to figure out how we move forward from there. On other ones I'm not quite sure yet how we disentangle those. I don't know if we deal with that in this resolution or if it's best to wait until the recommendations come back at the end. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen, did you want to speak? >> Kitchen: Yes, on item 35, I think all the bullet points make sense to me. I'm pretty agnostic on how we get there. I hear the concerns and agree with them that maybe we don't actually need the staff to come back with a list of recommendations. Maybe we should just talk through each of these and adopt them. I'd be happy -- each of these that everybody wants to do and adopt them. That might be the simplest way to do them. I do think that there -- most of them are pretty practical. At the end of the day depending on the details, the last one, for example, might not be something I ended up wanting to move forward with, but the rest of them I think are pretty straightforward and pretty concrete. And I'm going to have a conversation and say let's do them, the ones that we agree to. So that's that. On item number 34 I

[2:42:12 PM]

appreciate councilmember Flannigan's suggestions. I think about -- there's some of them that make sense to me and some that don't. So we could have a longer conversation about that. The overarching goals I agree with, what councilmember Casar is saying, which is a charter that makes it clear what we're doing. And I do think we need to be aligned back to the council's strategic outcomes, that you're suggesting. Until we get those outcomes, until we get clear on the outcomes, I don't know that we have to set up the committee's quite like you've suggested, but I absolutely agree that we really need to make sure that we're addressing the outcomes and I think the committee structure is a good way to do that. So I'm -- Jim just laying out what I'm thinking of. I also -- I would say that I do agree -- we're talking about a little bit of -- some of this is a matter of degree. And rather than the actual logistics of how we do it, but I do think it's important for the councilmembers to make a choice where they want to be. In that sense I think it is different from the legislature. At the legislature it's much more than who makes the appointment. It's who makes the decision. And at the less than it's the -- the speaker makes the decision about what you sit on. It's not just that he makes the list. To me we could talk about the

logistics of how it's done, but I think it's important that councilmembers choose what they want to be on. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. , Ms. Alter. Equal I'm confused with respect to the owe.

[2:44:13 PM]

>> Alter: I'm confused with the committee members. If we're trying to have a stopgap measure that allows us to keep meeting where we need to have certain meetings, need to have certain people on there. Because I think if it's a stopgap measure and we have to do that until we get to point where we're going to reform it, then I can support the general direction of that. If it's the solution to the problems we've identified, I don't think this is the solution. And so I would like some clarification on that. And then I don't mean to be a broken record on it, but 34 and 35 are intimately connected. It does not matter what committees we have if we have no rights, we have no resources that go to those committees. We are never going to get committees that function the way they want them to. If the process that goes through the agenda doesn't allow us to process what people are proposing, our committees are not necessarily going to function. So these two things are intimately linked and we may need to make a step forward on our committees to take some of the things that we decided, I guess it was last week or the week before, and move forward on those so that we can keep moving, but this is not -- this 34 is not a solution that gets us a well-functioning system. And one of the reasons we are not like the legislature is because we have no desire to delegate powers to these committees. So we have to accept that. The other thing I want to say about the agenda, and we can do this with committees too, but I think we have an opportunity to use some resources that we have at the city that will help us to make our process more transparent and effective. So I've heard a need with respect with our agenda to do both of these things. We've been talking a lot more about how to make it more effective from our perspective as councilmembers, but there are staff, there are citizens, there are a lot of other users of this system

[2:46:16 PM]

who may have needs that we're not thinking about. And because we are approaching it in this sort of very technocratic sort of way, we are miss ising opportunities. So if we called on some office within the city or got some group of people to take a look and where is it that we've been actually spending our time? Every one of you have anecdotal evidence about that, but you could take any one issue and trace it through the system and say here is where we are spending the time and this is the kind of issue that's really creating these bottle necks and those are the situations where we really need to have alternative public comment options or I don't know what we'll find, but we haven't really approached this as a creative problem that we could be solving in that way. I'm not saying to open up a big massive, giant Austin civic engagement process, but I do think a little bit more data in here is something we could get. All of our meetings are transcribed and there's a lot of information to be mined in that if we would just give it a chance. And we would get a better solution. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: Did the mayor pro tem want to speak before leaving? >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool, do you want to speak? >> Pool: I wanted to defer to the mayor pro tem because she's leaving -- >> Mayor Adler: Did you want to speak, mayor pro tem, before you leave? >> Tovo: I appreciate that, thanks. I think there are conversations to be had here and we've shifted into a completely different format here where we're each run of through these are my perspectives and not really discussing these issues. So I think that means that we'll be having that discussion on the dais on Thursday. You know, with regard to a couple of the issues that have come up, 35 for me, you know, while the language and the attachment is not

[2:48:17 PM]

prescriptive, the actual posting language is to initiate amendments. So I will just have to say that there are items on here that I can't support and I guess at this point certainly without more discussion, so I'm not sure where that leaves us for Thursday except to have the discussion about the different bulleted points. I mean, there are some that I think are great ideas, instituting standard hard breaks for lunch and dinner. There are others that I think require a good deal more discussion of having two different sets of meetings and I think what doesn't -- what does make these prescriptive for me is that they came from a message board post that had some clear recommendations and so if we're asking the staff to initiate amendments, but then saying consider, they're just going to go back -- my guess is they'll likely look to the specific suggestions you made, mayor, and I think we should have just had that conversation upfront about whether we want to start at 9:00. Or whether we want to try for at least a month or two getting there and starting right at 10:00 and seeing if that doesn't free up some more time. And I'm happy to consider starting a meeting earlier, but I'd sure like to start -- I'd sure like for us to, you know, have a pattern of starting at 10:00 for awhile and then see. You know, that time between 9:00 and 10:00 just as an example, you know, we are able -- my staff often go downstairs and talk with other staff and talk about issues that we might have pulled on the consent agenda. So that 9:00, 10:00 time has been pretty key. Those are just discussions, I think. I would prefer having before we ask the staff to go forward and initiate recommendations, I'm a co-sponsor on the committees and I appreciate the changes. I agree that we have more conversations to have without mission and purpose. I think one of the issues around which there's still discussion and not

[2:50:18 PM]

necessarily agreement, and I wanted to offer my opinion. When we -- when we did the committee appointments the first time we had several conversations, and I haven't been able to find the language, but we had several conversations about the fact that the committee membership selection by the mayor was kind of a one-time thing and that was going to be because it was an unusual circumstance, because it was a mostly new group, because there were so many appointments to be made and I really believe that we -- we made a commitment to do that on a one time basis and we should go back to a process that's more collaborative. It is a very different matter to have -- yes, we all confirm them, but it's very different once there's a list there. Then you're in a position of saying gee, I'd really like to serve on that. Could you vote for me instead of so and so. It's much different if we have the conversation here and say who is interested on being part of this? Great. Let's ask the staff to bring those appointments forward next week. It's a different process and I think it's respective of the system that we have where we each have our -- are representing a particular area and have one voice. I think that's what is consistent with our 10-1 system. So those are my thoughts on some of the issues that have arisen. Again, I'm not clear on what the process going to be for Thursday in terms of sorting these things out. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you, Ms. Pool. I'm one of the people, maybe one of a couple of people that really want to have some alignment with what we're doing. I think that's one of the problems that I've experienced over the last two years is that everybody has their own agenda and there's no place where it comes together to say this is the direction where we need to go. And that if we need to delay this because we all know it's broken, and we need to do something to fix it, but if we need to delay it until

[2:52:19 PM]

the consultants come back because I would like to have that kind of consistency from the council level to the manager, from staff to the assistant city managers and then to the manager, so that we're all really clear about if we have an item from council does that really match up with something that is our

priority. So if we need to have this conversation after they come back, which should be the end of March, first of April, I think that's what they said, is that what they said, then I'm willing to do that rather than doing make work now and then get the information back after the consultants come back and then try to realign once again. So I like to talk about committees and a structure that help us with our policy and decision making. And some of the other things I think in exhibit a are just things that I caught that were inconsistent and so that's -- I'm not going to talk about that today, but the the committee structure is broken. We need to fix it, but this may not be the right time. If we can skate along with what we've got until we get something really concrete and it doesn't bother me at all who that person or persons are. I've heard good suggestions from people who think that we should make those recommendations ourselves and vote on them. I've heard that the mayor should do it again, I think the issue is getting the committee structure rights so the next people coming on the council are not having to grapple with me. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: Thanks. I wanted to just weigh in a little bit on the alternative exhibit a that councilmember Flannigan offered up. I'm concerned about this

[2:54:20 PM]

would in effect make meetings that we would have not open meetings and I think the strength of this council is how much work we do with the public. And we were committed in our early conversations about committees to continue the tradition that the city had had for its committees of council that they would be open to the public. That's where we have the first opportunity to engage stakeholders directly. They come and speak to us. I know y'all are at a bit of a disadvantage because you haven't been -- you haven't spent the last two years in the committees. There was a lot of positive work that was done in those committees and I would hesitate to say that we were wasting our time. I like to think we were learning while we were in those committees and there was a whole lot of learn going on. So I would not be supportive of a committee -- I I wanted to make the committees larger, in fact. I wanted to give example opportunity for as many people who may want to serve on mobility committee to be on the mobility committee. So when we drafted up this exhibit a that came in the red line here it says under 25102 membership of the committees, except as otherwise provided by council and that phrase refers to the committees as a whole that we have. Each committee of council consists of no fewer than five councilmembers appointed by the council. And that the reason for that top number on there is that very reason. And I would like for everyone to indicate what committees they would like to serve on and we can see for ourselves this committee is now a committee of the whole or this committee is only going have five people on it. Or we may be fine that five people aren't posted in something. So some of this just has to -- we won't actually know until we go through the exercise of I want to be on these three committees and I

[2:56:21 PM]

just urge that we at least take that step because right now we just don't know. So that's the piece on open meetings and the number of people on the committees that I wanted to get into the record. As far as a list, I don't know about the concept of someone if someone had a list of who is going to be on a committee. If we as councilmembers are not intimately involved in saying and getting our names assigned to a committee, then that doesn't make any sense to me. These are autonomous committees. They are creatures of our council and we should be indicating what we want to serve on. So as far as a list, the only list I have is the one that may be the committees that I want to serve on. I wouldn't want to do that myself and I wouldn't expect anybody to have a list for me. So as far as the start time, and the mayor's suggestion on 35, I will point out that in -- in the end time I'll point out that our last two council meetings we finished well before 10:00 last week. It was 8:45. And we got close to 10 on our January

meeting. I have noticed with some real satisfaction and gratification that we are not going really late. We have had some long conversations and discussions about issues that had some controversy around them. But we managed to get to a solution and a decision without moving to go beyond 10:00 for the first two meetings of this council. And I think that's also should be noted by everybody, I also think it's a real strength of us as a group and I suspect that we will continue in that way and I -- I think that the point that the mayor pro tem made about the hour before 10:00 on Thursdays is used very productively by a lot of us in order to get things

[2:58:23 PM]

lined up, girding our loins in some ways getting ready for battle on some issues we'll be leading on when we start at 10:00. So I'm -- I would not want to start the council meetings any earlier than 10:00, but I would urge that we start at 10. And to wrap up all of this, I don't support a process handing this off to staff to craft how we're going to do things. I think that's on us and I think that any drafting that is done should be highly directed from us. This is how we want to conduct ourselves in the committees that we lead. -- And this is how we want them to proceed as well, including ample public input at both places. >> Mr. Renteria? >> Renteria: I just hope that people don't -- just because I was willing to combine my housing committee, neighborhood year we had a lot of issues that we took up and we passed a lot of good ordinances and resolutions through that. And I didn't feel like it was broken. I just felt like we have done so much work on it that the workload was declining. And I just didn't want to run my -- the housing staff people through just sitting there. And in the briefing I thought that the briefing could have been -- that's why I reduced my time on the second year from 12 to six meetings. So I think it's very important that we do have the committees up and we keep them. But it was just the mere fact that like this year, I think we'll have five meetings because there wasn't just that much work to do on it.

[3:00:24 PM]

Most of the -- most of the plans that we're working for affordable housing was long-term planning, which required a lot of inputs from staff and people from -- on the housing committee. So -- I still believe that we still need some kind of committees. And because there is going to be some issues coming up here in the future that we're going to have to spend some time on. So I just hope that you don't feel like that our committee structure was actually broken. It was -- we had just -- didn't have the work to justify meeting once or 12 times a year. >> >> Houston: Mayor, a segue in from what councilmember Renteria said. On exhibit a, page 2 and page 3, it looks like some of the mobility committees' activities have been put under item 7, the housing and planning committee. Is that correct? Or are we still going to have a mobility committee? >> Kitchen: No, it's -- >> Houston: What it feels like to me is that people are pretty entrenched with their organizations and it's not an open kind of discussion with where we can think about what are the best options for everybody. It seems like everybody is pretty much made some decisions about where they fall on a lot of issues. And it should be a collegial conversation about what works best for the 11 people that really try to represent the city on a whole lot of different matters. That's why I still go back to -- my preference would be to wait until we get something from -- we can keep doing this broken system like we're doing. And once we get the information back from the consultants, then let's stay to align those -- if we

[3:02:24 PM]

agree with that, let's try to align those priorities and then structure it moving forward. But I would agree that if we started on time that would help us tremendously. >> Mayor Adler: You will notice that very

lately I've been here. >> Houston: Beat me today. >> Mayor Adler: And I've been trying to start at the moment that a quorum shows up. One of the many things about being the new 10-1 council in the new year is we get to set up institutions and structure that will hopefully take too root and make it so that those who come after us don't have to spend time doing this kind of stuff. You know, there's part of me that really wants to focus -- I hear what Ms. Houston is saying, Ms. Alter said, what Mr. Flannigan said. I know what's being roped in the exhibit doesn't get it right because it doesn't fundamentally go to what it is that we need. Tried to start off the process not so much finding the solution, but identifying what was the goals that we are trying to solve? I do like at some point the idea of having the innovation office come in and look at it. And maybe there's a broader way to take a look at how we do these. And I spoke in favor of a gap -- stopgap measure to get us from here to there, but as I look at this document this goes beyond doing a stopgap measure. And we were just going to do a stopgap measure, but really do this right. Maybe there's a simpler stopgap measure to do -- to get us from here to there.

[3:04:26 PM]

There's still a lot of issues. In talking about, I like the idea of having the committees aligned with where we're going on the goals, if we're trying to align everything that happens in the city that that makes sense to me at some level. The issue of -- of who appoints the committees, obviously that was me. I -- I will tell you that just by way of example, when I did that, just so that you know what went into that, it went beyond just putting people on committees that they wanted to be on. Because the council had said this is where we think we have a need to have people get a chance to meet. I tried hard to put everything on committees that they wanted to be on. I tried really hard to balance committees that people wanted to be on with the appointments that were happening outside the city, with campo and with cap metro so people wouldn't be overworked relative to their load and people could get the things they really wanted to do. This is also because of part of the goal that the assignment I have is to make sure that we populated committees that not a lot of people wanted to be on. And I said, you know, you get this one that you really want, but somebody's got to do these others that not everybody wants to do or not everybody has signed on to that committee. But we didn't have to have that conversation publicly as we were setting that up. But tried to make sure that each of the committees that there were multiple views that were presented. So that if there was a committee that three people wanted to be on, but they were of the same view, to

[3:06:27 PM]

make it so that not everybody on the committee had the same view, if we were looking to do meaningful work. I'm not saying that I need to do that. I have a concern that goes -- is much bigger to me than that, with the amendment that came back institutionally. But I think there's some of that kind of element in deciding who should be on committees. It goes beyond just, I think, for the institutional benefit just who wants to be serving on that. A part of that depends on the fundamental question, which is what is the charter? What is it that we really expect the committees to do? And I thought that was a strength, Mr. Flannigan, where you laid out, because it went back to kind of looking at what is it that we want these committees to do. Some strength in what I think councilmember kitchen has -- that may vary to a degree depending on the individual subject matter, but generally speaking, it seems to me that we should decide what we want committees to do. What we're willing to delegate, what we're not willing to delegate. And I think that would be real important. And that doesn't feel to me to be resettled. But in terms of things that were on here that I think went beyond any of the conversations that we had, I look at the first thing that's been -- deleted in that section 2.5101 where the council by resolution or the mayor may create temporary task forces of councilmembers. So this is -- it goes to the issue of how

do you form the temporary committees when they're needed. And one way was a majority of the council could act by resolution and the other way was that the mayor could appoint one. And again, I'm obviously the mayor, but I'm trying to talk here institutionally.

[3:08:32 PM]

To say that everything gets governed by the council is to say that the majority rules and it is not true that the majority should rule. At all times. That's why we went from the at large to the 10-1 system .so when you have the majority to act, but also someone elected at large who is accountable to the entire city, there may be an ad hoc committee that an individual -- that the majority doesn't say should be done, but there are significant parts of the city or 40% of the city that might want something like that to happen or 50% of the city that might want something like that to happen. I think this allows for someone accountable to the entire city -- recognize the majority of the council Waneta elected by 40% of the city, so they don't have to be accountable to the other 40% city they didn't have to run in front of. So I would hope when we do this -- that section, by the way, that's stricken, has been in the code for awhile and predated 10-1 change. So to searchings like that that come out and part of the issue that I have with this is that we just got it, which goes back to the issue that I've had that relates to the next item 35 is we laid out the committee stuff we were talking about the first time we did it back in January of '15 and it was there for a long time for people to take a look at and the community to take a look at for discussions before we started making kinds of policy decisions. So I would hope that we

[3:10:33 PM]

would at least change that part because institutionally I think that that's an issue. With respect to 35,. >> Houston: Mayor, before you go to 35, could I speak to B as well? There are some temporary task forces that have been created by prior councils. There's no representation from the districts. I don't know how they got to be task force and when they stopped being task force. The one that comes to mind, and this is nothing wrong or derogatory about the task force, but this is the vision zero task force. Is it like a board or commission commission? Should I have an appointee to that? I've not been able to get information about how those people are identified and is there a stop date when they're no longer -- I know we fund them to do certain things, but task forces need to be really crafted and there needs to be a specific outcome. And at the end of that their work is done. >> Mayor Adler: I can't speak to that one. >> Houston: I know, but when we talk about task forces, those kind of things come to mind that we need to be very careful about what that means. >> Mayor Adler: And in with respect to B, I think that somebody ought to be able to appoint those that's accountable to the entire city and not just part of the city. >> Pool: Mayor, could I respond back on 34? >> Mayor Adler: Let me finish and then I'll go around the room. With respect to 35, the -- what I posted on the message board initially were not any recommendations, they were issues to be considered. I labeled it that way. I 2017 proposing any of them. As you know I've tried to get that brought up in the multiple conversations we've had about committees and have said repeatedly that I think they need to be considered at the same time because like councilmember alter, I think they're inextricably intertwined. If we're not able to do this yet, then we hold on, but I

[3:12:35 PM]

think they're inextricably intertwined F we want to go through each of these things to decide it, I'm fine with that so long as people have notice and we can think about it. I do like having the staff come back with things. Some of these probably we could vote on and say what we think. Some we may want to

give to the innovation people or in the staff and say look at best practices and tell us what you would remain taking a look at things for us to go. But I think that that's a possibility to -- where we could go through it and decide things. This is important stuff that we're trying to do here. And I really think that we should make sure at the end of the process that we have something that we really can hand off well. And that -- whatever we do now if we're not doing the whole thing is of such a temporary nature that everybody's expectation is it only lasts a few weeks, a month, a month and a half, two months until we can do that. And I'm not sure what we're setting up here feels like that to me. >> Pool: I wanted to go back to that 25.21, and this is about the mayor creating a temporary task force. If you look at it it's a matter of commas. My reading of this is you put the phrase by resolution at the beginning of that sentence then it says the same thing for councilmembers and the mayor, which is that by resolution the council or the mayor may create a temporary task force of councilmembers or councilmembers and other persons that are not -- anyway. The point being when we create something as a body we have access to city resources and staffing to support.

[3:14:36 PM]

And that has -- has broader implications. With the smaller councils maybe that wasn't so obvious, but if the mayor can create temporary task forces and have access to staff and resources without the council agreeing to it by resolution, that means that in the most extreme case the mayor, not you, but some mayor in the future, could come in and use up all of the staff's time and all of the budget with his or her own task force agenda leaving the rest -- because the council would never have to approve it. Leaving the rest of the council with nothing. And we could still try to pass things on resolution, but there may not -- the priorities given to the mayor that are not just by custom. That are not given to councilmembers. So my reading of this, mayor, and maybe we should go back and read the intent and listen to the public input whenever there was originally written was that the resolution piece should rightly apply to any and all of us if we are intending to reach into staff time and city revenues. So for me it's a matter wherever those commas are. >> Mayor Adler: So to that end that still has a majority of people who are only elected by 60% of the city able to make that decision. So the so far gap that this provided is it let somebody who is elected by the whole city come in and potentially act. And I hear you saying, not me, and I appreciate that, because I've lived with this. We've all lived with this. I have not tried not to be abusive of any of the charter provisions. I would say that if the

[3:16:37 PM]

council ever found themselves faced with a mayor that was abusing something, then if a concern is the abuse, then I would wait for it to be abused and I would address it. But to me right now it's changing something. Unless you think I've abused it. In which cases we should talk about the abuse. But if not, then it's an abuse -- if you think I have been improperly using city resources or denying everyone access to city resources, otherwise I would suggest that you wait for that and maintain the -- kind of the minority guarantee that is contained in that provision. >> Pool: And again, I was very, very careful to say that I was not talking about you. And I hope that the day doesn't come that there would be that kind of situation on this council. I really desperately hope that never happens, but it does leave that as a possibility. But I would -- and I would argue that it was simply misinterpreted. I would like to see what the legislative intent was at the time this was written. Then to the point that you're making about more people voted for you or the majority piece, I guess every voter had two votes. And one they gave to the mayor and one they gave to an individual councilmember. So in that case it's a 50/50 deal and that's -- that's one vote and one vote. I'm not sure where else to go with that offense. It's novel. I heard it articulated before and I still haven't quite settled my mind on how that applies to the rest of

[3:18:42 PM]

us. Because we are one vote on the council, each one of us, and it does take a majority to pass any legislation. And so I think that is what the intention was of the setting up of task forces and committees. And again, to the use of resources. Like we are all able to do ad hoc initiatives out of our own offices without engaging other staff. So I am not -- I'm not completely settled on that point. And I just do think that this has been misread or misinterpreted over time. >> Ms. Alter? >> Alter: I guess I'm a little concerned about having just received this and having to dive into some of the details. I wanted to point out a few things that I think we may not have accounted for. And I don't want to have to keep doing this for our stopgap. I don't have a dog in the fight about whether the mayor gets to do things or not, but I am thinking that we could have some scenario where we need immediate attention from some councilmembers on something in order to move something forward that happened, say, over the summer when we don't have enough councilmembers here to call an emergency meeting to vote on something and establish that task force. There could be some reason to have the mayor to have that ability to set that up and we're making that not possible. And I'm not seeing in here what happens if someone else wants to join a committee and it's not at the very beginning, but they're willing to commit to going to all the meetings. But they didn't know that they wanted to be it because they didn't know what the topic was until it was two months after the initial appointments. We haven't capped the number of committees, but there's no process for joining later if you're willing to commit to being part of the committee. How many people are on a task force. That's not specified so far

[3:20:43 PM]

as I can tell. There's a clause under 25103 B at the bottom that says it is the intent of council that the following subjects applicable to county committees be construed broadly and illustrated -- and then it says be again there. I'm just -- it's just hard to follow in that way. There's no big deal of adding task force to the support. But also why five members? It seems like then you're sitting it up that -- setting it up that you need to have more committees than now. So you reduce the number of committees to reduce the demands on our time, but we've increased the number of people that have to be on a committee in order for a committee to be there, so that takes more of our time. So I just -- I'm having some trouble putting all the dots together and doing this so quickly for Thursday for something that I see is extremely important. That's why I asked the question at the beginning is this meant to be a stopgap in which case I'm okay with changing the number of committees and doing some of the stuff or is this meant to be a solution that lasts for awhile. And depending on the answer to that question I look at this very definitely. >> Garza: And that is my question if it is intended to be a stopgap. I understand concerns that this may have gone beyond what was originally discussed and concerns about this being last minute and we just got this. So an option is put it off to the next council meeting and discuss it more. Another option is just address for me an important part was reducing the number of committees. So maybe we just address that part. We agree that there is-- it

[3:22:45 PM]

is a stopgap. We agree that we all had the discussion here and we all agree that the number of committees or the kinds of committees and then add an 11 or whatever the numbering works out to says, and we will look at this -- we find out from the consultants when that strategic outcomes will be back and say that we will look at this again on April whatever to determine how we align this with our strategic outcomes is maybe an amendment sheet I will be producing, but listening to all the feedback.

For me it was a stopgap measure because there was extreme consensus -- not even consensus. I'll go back to the consultant literally jumping and screaming that everybody said the committee system wasn't working. It was an attempt at reform, just a first step. >> Pool: I'd be happy to join you on that. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: >> I feel like we're talking about a lot of different things and not staying focused, which is fine. I just really wanted to comment. I wanted to follow up on what councilmember Houston and councilmember pool said and I wanted to be really clear that this is not about any person. We have to be very careful to separate the policy from the person. So everything that I say is not about our mayor who I respect and trust and has done a great job for us. So please don't think this is about you. So I don't think that the question should even be asked about whether or not we think that you're doing what you need to do. That's not the criteria here on what we're doing in terms of setting policy. So I wanted to make that clear. So I wanted to -- a couple of things trouble me and lead me to believe that

[3:24:47 PM]

we're much better off if we put a task force in place by a resolution. And one of the things that troubles me is the concerns that councilmember Houston is bringing up about the lack of clarity between what we're doing when we have a task force. And I think about it a little bit. What this came up for me when I thought about -- we shed we would have committees that maybe we didn't need all these standing committees, so we were going to have a task force. To me if I think about a committee and temporary committee, which is really what we're talking about, it makes it easier for me to say a temporary committee should really be set up by the will of the group just like a standing committee. So that's how I fall down on that. I also would just caution you us to not compare our positions. I was on the charter review commission and we had lots of discussion about what is an at large person versus a person that represents a district. And you may remember this. And my takeaway from that was that everybody's vote counts and everybody's vote represents every part of the city and everybody's vote is the same. And we had some discussions of what that would look like if we had some at-large folks on the council. I think that applies to the mayor as well. I really can't support the thinking that because the mayor was elected by everyone -- we're not talking about you, but because the mayor was elected by everyone, that means the mayor gets to appoint ad hoc committees that use committee resources and are of the level of degree that they're really temporary committees. That that's not a function for the whole. So that's where I'm coming from. I do recognize that there are plenty of ad hoc things that everybody does and plenty of ad hoc things that the mayor should be able to do. I have to do a little more thinking about where that line is. What's the difference

[3:26:49 PM]

between what rises to the level of a temporary committee. I'll call it that to make it clear. And what's more something that's ad hoc? I don't know the answer to that. I have to think about that. But I did want to comment on the conversation we were having and I wanted to be real clear that I think it's important that for at least what I consider to be a temporary committee that it have the weight of the council as a whole. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan? >> Flannigan: A lot of good discussion on this and I think I'm with the mayor on what the stopgap measure is and what the plan is for a committee structure. I think that the proposal has come out is maybe a little maybe too much for a stopgap. If we were just just reducing the committees, that makes sense. I would support that in a heartbeat. If we're having consultants coming back at the end of March with a more fleshed outset of strategy outcomes, I'd continue fleshing out my proposals to the committee outcome so it would dove tail with the consult of the consultant. There were a number of other issues that I'll address on the council message board to

save time here today. I do want to say that with the cameras on -- councilmember pool, I think you and I may be thinking about the word open differently. I think that -- a meeting that's in this room with the cameras on, that people can come in and watch, is still an open meeting whether or not we're taking public testimony. So I don't want the community to think that I'm trying to set up some type of closed meeting situation. I think from a time perspective it makes sense that you can have one type of meeting just like the corridor -- the code advisory group had appointees and councilmembers sitting together and there wasn't public testimony being taken. We were just working on the issues. I think that's still an object meeting. And I would want to make that clear so the committee

[3:28:49 PM]

didn't misunderstand what I was proposing. >> Mayor Adler: As I recall when we set it up and did the ordinance, the way that we said it was that you had to have the posted meeting in order for the folks to take any action. So the community knew that there wouldn't be any action taken -- there wouldn't be any action taken unless they had the opportunity to come and testify is how we drafted it. We kept it as four people so that if there were logistical issues or whatever, those four people could meet and then process and whatever it was, not taking any kind of action, setting things up. So we had drafted and drafted our ordinance specifically to say when we posted -- it was always tied to when there would be action. >> Flannigan: And what I'm working through in my proposal is a committee that takes no action. So it would be a substantive different thing. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Do we want to talk about this any more? Mr. Casar? >> Casar: I would say as a stopgap I would be ready on Thursday to vote on reducing the number of committees to the committees as they're listed. And doing the hard lunch stop in two or three hours. There's not consensus on when the meeting starts and when the if cs'ed, but on the middle parts of 35, I don't have it in front of me, but I think that probably everybody agrees like on those -- my computer just died so I just lost that. If we wanted to reduce the number of committees and then to -- oh? If we could have a time for the committees, to have some non-ceremonial meetings, that sort of thing, I'm ready to go forward with that on Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Any further discussion? Ms. Houston, is your light on? >> Houston: Yes, sir, it

[3:30:50 PM]

is. I'm good with options for non-ceremonial meetings and options for meeting focused for large public hearings because when we know those are there I think we need to take extraordinary care to make sure that those are available to people. Reducing the number of people to allow people to donate time. The deadline for item from council that should include bum we may have the item from council, but backup comes the morning of. That's not helpful for me. I'm a slow reader so I need to have the backup sooner rather than later. So if we could include that in the backup, then I would be willing to do those things. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else -- >> Houston: I'm still not good with 34. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? With that said, then we will adjourn the work session. [Adjourned].